







Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2008 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

WAR AND RATIONAL POLITICS

BY
CHARLES W. HAYWARD

LONDON :
WATTS & CO.,
17 JOHNSON'S COURT, FLEET STREET, E.C.
1915

“MILITARISM”

AND THE EUROPEAN WAR OF 1914.

THE world is in travail with pains of hell
 For the birth of a devil-king,
 Begot by a lust blood-drunken Power,
 Betrayed by an armour ring.

With poisoned draughts of deceitful praise,
 With lies of a “Call Divine,”
 Each noble pulse of a nation’s soul
 Was debauched by a maddening wine.

“Drink deep of this Heaven-sent sparkling
 cup!”

(Though its frothing befools your brain);
 “To you is given, by God’s command,
 To rule o’er world-wide domain.”

“To you is the progress of man consigned!
 To you the all-conquering might!
 Heaven calls you to battle with sword of steel!
 Your duty—go forth and fight!”

“Fight! for the Prussian, the chosen race,
 Shall ’stablish the Kingdom of Man
 Ordained by the Kingdom of Heaven for you
 ’Ere yet the world began!”

“Fight! slay! and spare not; love is weak;
 Naught counts save power and might!
 Yours is the quest of the Holy Grail;
 Arm ye! Go forth and fight!”

Alas! that the Devil in serpent guise
 Hath triumphed once more on earth;
 And passion’s lust, with seductive breath,
 Sown seeds for this monstrous birth.

And the fearful pains of this lie-drunken power,
 This madness, with lust defiled,
 Now calls for dire human sacrifice
 To strangle this hell-born child.

Yet this sacrifice is the true-born heir
 Of the Kingdom of Heaven on earth;
 And this monster of lies and hate shall die,
 And the “Love of Mankind” give birth.

CHARLES W. HAYWARD.

Liverpool, Sept. 20.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
FOREWORD - - - - -	vii
I. WAR CAN BE DEFENDED ONLY BY A BETRAYAL OF REASON - - - - -	1
II. REASON IS STRANGLED BY BARBARIC FORMAL- ITIES, FALSE SENTIMENT, AND COWARDICE IN WHAT IS KNOWN AS "DIPLOMACY"- - -	6
III. DEMOCRACY MUST LEAVE THE NURSERY, AND INSIST UPON FAIRPLAY IN THE MANAGEMENT OF ITS AFFAIRS - - - - -	10
IV. THE INSANITY OF STAKING THE FORTUNES OF MILLIONS UPON THE ERRATIC POSSIBILITIES OF ANY ONE MAN OR CLASS - - - -	15
V. "REASON" INSULTED BY SO-CALLED "AUTHORI- TIES," AND EVEN NEGLECTED BY WELL-MEAN- ING COUNSELLORS - - - - -	20
VI. AMAZING AND DANGEROUS DELUSIONS, NOT AS YET ENTAILING RESTRAINT IN AN ASYLUM -	26
VII. LUNACY IS "INFECTIOUS," AND REQUIRES STRICT RESTRAINT LIKE OTHER "INFECTIOUS DISEASES"	32

	PAGE
VIII. MORAL COWARDICE - - - - -	38
IX. "IMMORALITY" IS ENTIRELY A "DISEASE OF THE MIND" - - - - -	43
X. SYMPTOMS OF INSANITY—WITH "FIRST AID" HINTS - - - - -	47
XI. THE FRUITS OF "MILITARISM" AND A HOPE -	52
XII. THE RETURN TO SANITY - - - - -	56
XIII. "WAR" AND "HUMAN NATURE" - - - - -	65
XIV. THE FUTURE WELTPOLITIK - - - - -	71

FOREWORD.

A WORD of explanation may obviate criticisms of these pages being founded upon any misapprehension.

Those of us who have for years deplored the wastefulness of war, and the absence from any place in the relations between separate States of even that amount of true morality which obtains among the classes of any one State, have been called "Little Englanders," "Blue-Water School," "Pro-Boers," etc.

When one party to a dispute invents a "popular tag" for his opponent—generally in the hope of implying some supposed moral delinquency—it is a proof of either his bankruptcy in argument or deficiency in brains.

If the childish infatuation for "swagger" be eliminated, and adult "reason" be given a chance, "war" stands out as a simple lunacy. A great many of those who consider that the "glory of the British Empire" is safe only so long as they have the selection of the items on the programme, have had the time of their lives since the present war broke out. With irresponsible bombast they have propounded the conundrum: "Where would we have been now except for what you call our expensive navy?"

I do not know any "Peace" advocate who desired that Britain should not have a strong navy, *so long as the Prussian military lunatics were unrestrained*. But every "Peace" man considered that there would have been more hopefulness of curing these lunatics either by healthier surroundings or by a universal combination for restraint than in our so-called "diplomacy" of goading the "lunatics" to increasing frenzy. This "Prussian lunacy" began in 1862, when the doctrine of "swelled head" was invented by Bismarck.

It has gone on increasing, its danger being recognized by all the other Powers, who have allowed petty jealousies to prevent such combination of several of them as could have stamped out the disease at comparatively slight cost.

Instead of this sane arrangement, we have seen the European Powers, while pharisaically lamenting every new Prussian raving, each imitate every antic and insane development.

One man stands out alone in honour—namely, the Czar of Russia. He at least regretted the infective insanity of Europe so deeply that he had the courage to defy the paralyzing cowardice and, in the name of international sanity, to call a consultation for the extermination of this disease. Here at last was a chance of redemption! But what happened was an amazing disgrace and degradation to civilization. Representatives of twenty-six nations attended. Two dozen of these considered that the real lunacy existed only in the remaining one or two, and that they themselves were only “innocently inoculated” with the disease.

Two dozen presumably sane nations—and only one, or two, centres of “infective madness”—and yet these two dozen did nothing except make themselves ridiculous, and deny the claim of mankind to either sanity or morality. Through childish jealousies and despicable cowardice they deliberately chose the alternative of mutual suspicions and hatreds, and the idiotic policy of watching the original maniac, and then each imitating his every fresh raving with either their best possible imitation or a still greater outrage upon reason!

This “War of 1914” is the breakdown of such an idiotic policy. The combination to crush this Prussian lunacy—which could have been accomplished and respected in former years—has been thrust upon these “amateur, or imitative, lunatics” by a convulsion of Reason, outraged beyond endurance by a new depth of infamy attained by the Prussian lunatic.

The reflection that “it is good luck more than good management” to which we owe the present sane understanding and co-operation for the extermination of this military madness is a bitter one. The unreasoning cowardice of extra-Prussian Europe has for years poisoned the draught of happiness for those of us who have earned opprobrium by complaining of the want of cleanliness in our national goblets.

But, if we have suffered the more because we recognized that the disease only existed in inverse ratio to “reason,” we are now filled with the brighter hope that the greater cost and the more terrible sacrifice demanded by long-outraged Reason will establish her more firmly upon the honoured pedestal from which she shall cast her “searchlight which banishes all shadows” upon the counsels and actions of mankind o’er all the earth.

C. W. H.

Liverpool, February, 1915.

I.

WAR CAN BE DEFENDED ONLY BY A BETRAYAL OF REASON.

THE first statement to be made when introducing the subject of war and its relation to rational politics is, that such discussion implies no condemnation, lack of support, or disloyalty in the present awful struggle in Europe. Rather does it imply a more intense determination to "carry this thing through" to the furthest limit. This is not the degradation of any one combatant; not the aggrandizement of any other one, or more, contestants; not the humiliation or bankruptcy of any one nation; not the plantation of bitter hatred in the hearts of one people for any other people. All such fiendish ambitions could be obtained by staying the upraised hand of those who are fighting for justice and morality in politics, before the real conquest had been gained. All this slaughter, all this misery, all this suffering, all these tears and privations, this insane waste of blood and treasure, will be thrown away unless the Allies can truly declare, before they cry any truce, that war itself is slain.

This present amazing horror in Europe has to some extent soothed the sense of injury from which many have long suffered because of their advocacy of the abolition of war, and the substitution of some international process which will settle mental differences upon the mental plane. It is such a cheap sneer for people whose "mental plane" is too wobbly and thin to bear any

strain, to reply: "Such an idea is silly, or at any rate Utopian. Man has always been a fighting animal, and always will be." I agree that, if these people have their way, such a deplorable future for the human race would be assured. Their argument is based upon ignorance. What they really mean is that "Man is an animal; all other animals settle their quarrels by brutal struggles and death; therefore man, being an animal, must and will do the same." A more childish mix-up of syllogisms, conclusions, and false premises never libelled the name of "argument." Have these people never heard that "man" is the only animal with "reason"? To prevent opponents flying off on a false scent it is well to state that there is no place here for haggling as to "whether animals also do not have reason." Evolution itself suggests that the existence of reason in the supreme animal "man" implies its rudiments and progression in the contiguous steps of the ascending ladder. My point is that "man" has it in its highest form, and that it is his innate duty to foster, cultivate, and improve it. Permitting these opponents to claim any percentage of "reason" for the animal world, it is still clear that "man" is the only animal which can formulate his reason in speech, communicate it to others in manuscript, inherit former fortunes of it from ancestors, and bequeath freshly garnered fruits of it to successors.

Other animals do not fight over "mental plane" disputes. They live entirely below this plane, and fight only as animals. Even those who uphold "war" hardly dare to defend it for similar "animal" gains, but bombastically talk about establishing "opinions" and "right" (both restricted to territories upon the "mental plane"), by descending to the lower "animal plane" and spilling one another's blood. It is idiotic. It is impossible to settle any single "mental plane fact" by means of the

most ghastly mutilations upon the "animal plane." I have a perfect right to the possession of my own watch, and to peaceably walk in the highway. My opponent knocks me down and takes my watch, or terminates my promenade by shooting me. He has not altered my right in the least, but has only over-ridden it by making himself a thief or a murderer. No doubt he will agree that human society depends for its existence upon some superior force of "law" restraining such examples of "man being a fighting animal" among members of any one community. Where is his pretended reason, or any glimmering of logic, when he goes on to maintain the usefulness or necessity of exactly opposite principles between the different communities of men? Why should he slander the human race and say that we can enforce right and justice anywhere within any imaginary and constantly extending "frontier," but are impotent for reason, and utterly bestial¹ when the dispute is between any two neighbouring men, one of whom stands upon one side of this imaginary line while the other stands across the same hysterical obstacle? Does he argue that such international aggressions constitute "statesmanship"? No "right" was ever extinguished by brute force. Growing freedom of thought insists that any suppressed "right" shall be again forced to the front; and, in fact, all social legislation, all freedom and improvement in politics, consist of the disinterments of these suppressed natural rights, and their emancipation from the brute forces of past appeals to "fighting and oppression."

You cannot even smother a scientific discovery or theory by the diabolical expedient of brute force. Giordano Bruno was in the year 1600 condemned and

¹ I prefer this form, though now described as "obsolete."

burnt by the blockheads of that day, in the hope of finally disproving his theory that the fixed stars were suns, each with its invisible satellites! Did they succeed? Is not all the praise and glory Bruno's, and all the execration the reward of those contemptible fools who, even in those less enlightened days, attempted to "rectify disputes upon the mental plane" by means of appeals to absolutely the lowest instincts which exist upon the lower "animal plane"?

I have consistently opposed war as any solution of international disputes, for the same reason that even its apologists see the degradation and futility of assault or murder for the adjustment of matters of opinion or justice among their own families or fellow-citizens. I do not base my opposition upon the enormous waste of wealth, the sacrifice of lives, the untold sufferings and misery to the soldiers and their dependents. All these are unassailable buttresses of my strategic position; but the essential strength of the citadel is the absolute futility of war for advancing anything whatever in the realm of freedom, happiness, health, culture—in fact, towards any single blessing which man's superiority over other animals renders him capable of enjoying or achieving. This persisting barbarian worship of brute force, this appeal to fangs to cover weakness of any higher characters, is responsible for all present-day social and class injustices within communities, and for the distressing animal combats between disputing communities.

While I deplore this fact, I recognize as fully as any recruiting officer that in the present war it is essential for the people of all the allied nations to meet force with force; to defeat Might—glorified into a malignant deity—by Might allied with justice and protection of weaker objects of this malignant covetousness. My

belief makes me hope for—if possible—even more resolute determination, higher courage, further sacrifice, if necessary, than the mere crushing of inflated ambitious demands. I want this war pushed home until not only its exciting causes are destroyed, but until the false perspective, the blatant appeal, and the non-human arbitrament of brute passion are annihilated utterly.

II.

REASON IS STRANGLER BY BARBARIC FORMALITIES, FALSE SENTIMENT, AND COWARDICE IN WHAT IS KNOWN AS "DIPLOMACY."

EVEN those who shudder most at the reports of the courage and carnage in the present war regard these horrors as unavoidable burdens of the human race. They are no such thing. They are simply due to the lamentably slow evolution of humanity from the unreasoning brute into the rational human being. I am told that "war is inevitable." I combat this assertion, and when my opponents are finally driven out of the position by the recognition of the fact that war is not "rationally" inevitable they entrench themselves behind the statement that "war is inevitable under present conditions."

This strategic movement in retreat gives away the entire battlefield. It is the "present conditions" which supply all that "is inevitable." Let us trace the true blame backwards, and as a preliminary exercise take a simple illustration.

Much misery and privation are caused to the wife and children of a carter because he is killed by falling from his cart and breaking his neck. Was all this misfortune "inevitable"? No. Even granting the calamity, the misery might have been greatly mitigated by true social legislation for the protection of those suffering undeserved troubles. Was the death inevitable? Why did the man fall from his cart? Because the wheel came off. That is a good enough answer. Why did the wheel come off?

Because those who had done some repairs to the cart did not replace the linch-pin, which would have prevented the wheel from sliding along the axle until it fell off and precipitated the man on to his head.

The present war, the awful sacrifices and horrors, are certainly "inevitable" "under present circumstances." The cart of civilization has toppled over. Death and suffering, misery and want, are universal; but was it truly "inevitable" that the cart should topple over? It is an exact parallel to the illustration. Our international morality and common sense, like the cart wheel, supported the strain of the weight of the cart so long as it did not move. But immediately it began to revolve round some "international diplomatic axle" it began to wobble. There was no "linch-pin" of "rationalism" to hold it in place. Even on the smoothest road disaster was certain eventually; but rude jolts and bumps from careless or drunken drivers must of necessity cause the wreck, no matter how skilful the driver of this cart may be. No blame attaches to the drivers of our national cart. They strove manfully and skilfully. But was it fair to give them a cart to drive when there was no linch-pin to prevent the wheel from coming off? The entire blame for the accident, the entire reproach for the horrors, are, in truth, due to the fools who left out the linch-pin. It is no excuse to say that "they did not do it on purpose," or "that linch-pins were unfashionable." Some consideration may be claimed for ignorance; but ignorance itself is culpable.

All nations have, I allow, been running the same inexcusable risk. One or two may have tried the effect of a bit of thin wire instead of a proper pin in the axle. But the real blame is upon us—the peoples—who have from carelessness, ignorance, or pure brutality, neglected to insist that our national cart shall not be driven without

a really honest and well-made linch-pin in each end of the axles.

Our neglect has opened opportunities for carelessness, scamping of work, and even for devilish planning of future calamities. Let us notice some proofs of this contention, and the ways in which this omission of the insertion of the "linch-pin of rationalism" into home and foreign politics obstructs every effort for social reform and invites international wreckage. We must remember that, as all the nations drive abreast, day by day, down the same road of progress, there must necessarily occur from time to time situations where the traffic must be carefully regulated in order to avoid collisions and mutual damage. With anything like decency and fairplay, this can be accomplished, as the traffic is all in the one direction of progress. Some sacrifice may be necessary in speed; but, with the honest recognition that everybody else has as much right to travel along this road as ourselves, nothing but good humour need prevail—unless we are fools enough to neglect to ensure an efficient linch-pin of reason. All the real danger comes from some one or more brutal or drunken drivers. There is, unfortunately, no doubt that such exist; but they have no right to do so, and they would not do so at the present time except for the miserable and petty jealousies still enthralling each of us, so that we will not freely and frankly combine to throw them off the road and destroy their carts. We all of us are possessed by the paralyzing terror that one or other of us will cheat, and that while we are chastizing these brutes this one will sneak off to his own cart and whip up to an advanced position. Both the suspicion and the sad fact are again the products of cupidity strangling reason.

The present war and recent history provide excellent illustrations of the application of this parable-like

(or parabolic?) statement. For some years past the various drivers of national vehicles have undergone welcome mental development. They have more and more "reasoned" that the advance of the human race is compatible only with the individual advance of each of its parts; that each part has equal right to this advance; that it is inevitable by the law of evolution, which applies as much to social and mental sciences as to natural history; that, in proportion to the growth of mutual sympathy and justice, advance is more rapid and crowded with pleasures instead of worries and jealousies. But all through these hopeful years there has been one irresponsible driver who has drunk so deeply of the wine of Egomania that he has "seen things," the most prominent of which is himself glorified with a halo, and in the attitude of the sceptred monarch of this revolving earth. He has bumped his mad way along so far through several streets, the most evident results being the natural annoyance of the peaceable and rational drivers and the exhibition of his own foolery. At last he has smashed things up, and all must pay the penalty. Was it "inevitable" that such a demented driver should be permitted to endanger all the others? Would not reason have banished the suspicions, and caused all the others to combine to remove the common danger? However, practically every other driver in the same street has now stopped his progress, climbed over the side of his cart, and "gone for" this irrational brute. That is to me the most hopeful thing I have struck for a quarter of a century. It will be an absolutely immoral proceeding if these now co-operating drivers allow this road-hog to have any cart at all to drive in the future, unless he will sign the pledge against self-intoxication, and faithfully obey all the new and much-improved regulations to be adopted for international communications.

III.

DEMOCRACY MUST LEAVE THE NURSERY, AND INSIST UPON FAIRPLAY IN THE MAN- AGEMENT OF ITS AFFAIRS.

"PETER PAN," or "the boy who never grew up," is a delightful character as a romance ; but, taken as a model to be slavishly copied by nations with a glorious history behind them, and still more glorious possibilities before them, he is a danger and an anachronism. In the infancy of nations, when all their properties and liabilities were contained in a metaphorical wheelbarrow, it was necessary that the steering of this vehicle over the primitive pathways should be entrusted to some chosen level-headed individual. One of the greatest disasters which has ever overtaken the human race is that this original "choice" founded upon "merit" was transformed into an automatic descent founded upon accident. Some people may cavil at my calling "heredity" an "accident." Of course, speaking strictly corporeally, it is not an accident ; but all history has proved that it is a mere "accident," and not even within the limits of an entertainable speculation, whether any "hereditary successor" will turn out to be a seer or an idiot, a philanthropist or a blackguard. Still, in national childhood's simple days this "lucky-bag leadership" was the rule, and, however they have otherwise matured the national "Peter Pans," are still in babbling infancy as regards rational individual responsibilities in the controlling of their respective national destinies.

Hence we find that in the year of grace 1914 it is still possible for a "penny-in-the-slot" hereditary ruler to wield the fortunes of untold millions who have never done any real crime calling for such a punishment, and who have to accept weal or woe according to whether his outstanding characteristics are commendable or despicable.

In the year 1888 the German automatic machine, with an ominous click, dropped William II into the driver's seat of the national cart. It was not altogether a lucky draw for the nation. The old retainer, who had been the real driver for many years, and who, although rough and rather overbearing, had earned the respect of other drivers, soon sized up the situation when referring to his own resignation, in the phrases: "I cannot stand him any longer.....I cannot make genuflexions, or crouch under the table like a dog.....I cannot tack on as a tail to my career the failures of arbitrary and inexperienced self-conceit, for which I should be held responsible."

And this is the driver who, through the grace of the automatic machine, and by permission of Peter Pan politics, has been tugging at the reins and sawing the German cart all over the road, while he and his boon companions have been making the neighbourhood hideous with ribald choruses of alternate hymns to his self-guessed divinity and their reflected glory, with jeering taunts to all other national carts whose passengers have more manners and less blatancy.

It is impossible to regard this position with too much concern or seriousness. Here is a man with practically unlimited powers for either good or evil, not only to his own nation, but to every civilized nation, and through them even to the remaining "uncivilized" communities. Let us judge him out of his own mouth; and he himself would be the last to belittle the evidence.

In his address to the German soldiers despatched to China in 1900 he said (*Bremen Weser Zeitung*): "When you meet the foe you will defeat him. No quarter will be given, no prisoners taken. Let all who fall into your hands be at your mercy. Just as the Huns a thousand years ago, under the leadership of Etzel [Attila], gained a reputation in virtue of which they still live in historical tradition, so may the name of Germany become known in such a manner in China that no Chinaman will ever again even dare to look askance at a German." Some years ago I took temporary charge of one of the largest lunatic asylums in Scotland, and among the many cases of "moral insanity" in that asylum there was not one who was not less serious than the man who had tabulated his own case in the above speech.

Again, in the present war he addressed his troops thus: "Remember that the German people are the chosen of God. On me, on me as German Emperor, the Spirit of God has descended. I am His weapon, His sword, and His vice-regent. Woe to the disobedient. Death to cowards and unbelievers." Well, I, for one, will have to run the risk of that last threat. In every large asylum there is usually at least one patient whose delusion is that he is the Deity. I have conversed with such, and their gravity is pathetic. If there is any asylum without such an inmate as a subject of study, this asylum has been cheated ever since 1888, as William II was a fully qualified candidate; and, while he could have there cultivated his hobby to his full desire, Europe would have avoided all the past and the horrible present price for his escape. Did his unfitness tend only in the direction of this beatific delusion, and not at all towards the moral distortion shown in the first quotation, he would still have been unfit to wield the destinies of any nation, as he would be an easy prey for

either other monomaniacs or "national fund kleptomaniacs" who manufacture war materials. Personally, I give the German Emperor credit for this position, in that I consider that his Egomania has been so worked upon by Prussomania and Kruppomania that it has been goaded into the homicidal delirium responsible for such ravings as his speech: "Our German people will be the granite block on which the good God may complete His work of civilizing the world"; and, "If one wishes to settle something in this world, the pen is only powerful so long as it is backed by the power of the sword."

I believe that it was the late Lord Salisbury who said that "wars served no other useful purpose than to teach people geography." It was cynical, but true—up to the present war. Fortunately, during the last few years the soil of the national consciences has been harrowed and dug with the implements of "social agriculture." Ideas have been planted, seeds sown, such as were never known before. Those of us who helped the planting looked forward with lamentable foreboding to weary years of waiting for the beneficent crop, knowing how dimly the sun of education shines through the fog of ignorance and prejudice, and how feeble are the showers of sympathy from the clouds of stored-up wealth. The present war has fructified the soil with the co-mixed blood of all classes: those who needed sympathy, and those who could bestow it; those who suffered undeserved poverty, and those who enjoyed unearned and superfluous wealth. And as those of us who stand aside from the awful carnage watch the proud and the poor, the high and the low, with equal courage, and, shoulder to shoulder, risk and lay down their lives to establish international morality, pouring out their blood in one intermixed stream, we see that a huge wave of brotherhood has

swept across our nation, sweeping away narrow ideas, barriers of prejudice, and ignorant misunderstandings; and we recognize that the blood of all is the same colour and the same sacrifice—that the courage of all and the nobility of all is the same, whether usually clothed in purple or in overalls. And, when this war is over, things will never be the same as they were before. Nineteen-twentieths of our rigid political and other “convictions” are due entirely to a “prejudiced point of view.” We see a man hurrying along a street in the dark, and we immediately judge him to be a criminal bent upon evil or hurrying from justice; whereas it is just as possible that he is a doctor attempting to beat death in a race to an accident. In any event, we ought to have suspended judgment, as we had no evidence whatever. As I desire to escape such condemnation, I shall shortly give some evidence to substantiate the accusation that the Prussian “World-power” lunatics are primarily responsible for existing barbarism.

IV.

THE INSANITY OF STAKING THE FORTUNES OF MILLIONS UPON THE ERRATIC POSSI- BILITIES OF ANY ONE MAN OR CLASS.

THERE is plenty of evidence that the Kaiser has been subject to malevolent and unprincipled pressure. We have the emphatic evidence of Bismarck, to which reference has been made.¹ No better or more pliable instrument could be conceived for the diabolic ambitions of the militarist monomaniacs. Any man who suffers from the delusion that he is, if not actually divine, certainly "the vice-regent of the good God" on earth, can be flattered and cajoled into developing this supposed all-mightiness in any direction offering the greatest temptation and the most alluring prospects of still further self-inflation. Not long ago Herr Ballin, Germany's greatest shipowner and commercial representative, was asked, when on a visit to London: "What is to be the outcome of Germany's activities? Is it to be war or peace?" He replied: "I do not know. All we industrial and commercial men are shouting 'peace' into one ear of the Emperor, and all the militarists are shouting 'war' into the other; and nobody can say which will triumph."

We all know now which has triumphed. And it was to be expected. Self-obsession as a demi-god must naturally prefer this image glorified with a universal sceptre, having put all men under his sway, rather than a supposed humdrum ruler over a contented and pros-

¹ Page 11.

perous nation. The war chariot, the conqueror's strut, and the cringing captive, form a vision which appeals far more strongly to an unbalanced intellect than any dream of a non-theatrical benefactor promoting the social betterment of a grateful but non-worshipping people.

And this military degradation was the easier because of his own pecuniary interest in war material; so that not only his infatuation, but also his pocket, pulled downwards towards barbaric ambitions. In *Bataille Syndicalist* (April 29, 1913) appeared: "The affair goes back as far as 1867, when the present Emperor's grandfather, in order to push forward Bismarck's plans against France, made a personal sacrifice to help Krupp in extending his works. He took up shares for £800,000, which have since at least trebled their value, and are now in the hands of William II, who is thus directly interested in the promotion of armaments, which he claims in the name of the Fatherland."

Mr. Archdeacon, editor of a Paris review, *La Controverse*, says: "This explains pretty clearly why William II, who is at bottom a pacifist, gives himself up from time to time to warlike manifestations, just sufficient to make the Reichstag vote the extra credits for the orders given to the Krupp firm." I shall treat this armament aspect of the question later; but I mention this intimate personal relationship of the Kaiser now to explain the wobbles of an insecurely balanced mind between the better nature and the malign influence of sycophants.

Many of us have learnt more than geography since the outbreak of the present war, and I at once acknowledge that I have had to qualify one of the opinions I previously maintained. I have frequently been scoffed at because I have asserted that the German nation did not desire quarrels or war with England, any more than the English nation wished for war with Germany. I

have asked my argumentative opponents for the evidence upon which they founded their accusations; but they have never been able to produce any, and I do not accept unsubstantiated prejudices as any basis for alteration of my opinions or beliefs. But now I have read Dr. Emil Reich's *Germany's Swelled Head* and Bernhardt's *Germany and the Next War*, among other things, and am convinced that there was a limited but very powerful class of devil's advocates, whose sole ambition was to attempt to crush England by war, so as to remove her out of the path of their megalomaniac desires. I do not plead guilty to culpable ignorance. Even the Professors of Modern History at Oxford state in their recent book, *Why we are at War*, that "up to the eve of the present war Great Britain has consistently refused to believe that Germany would be mad enough or dishonest enough to enter on a war of aggression for the dismemberment of colonial empires. German diplomacy in the past few weeks has rudely shattered this conviction."

But those of us who gave the masses of the German people credit for equal morality and sanity as ourselves were perfectly right after all. This is most decidedly not a war of the German people, but solely of the despicable class of inflated fools known as the military caste, in league with the unprincipled armament mongers. The German people themselves are merely the unfortunate prisoners of infernal "present conditions," which I have indicated previously; and these "present conditions," which drive—in devil's chains of lust and madness—the democracies of the world, are the one and only enemy to be slain and stamped under foot amid the execrations of all who have any spark of conscience. I desire to urge this as the essential truth of the present outrage upon civilization.

Even amid present inflamed passions, when blood

blots out all sight of nobility, and when the smell of carnage nauseates humanity, this fact is established. In the *Times* of August 15, 1914, was published a copy of a document sent by the committee of the German Humanitarian League to the British Humanitarian League, in which the Kaiser was described as "the uncurbed tyrant, surrounded by parasites, now directing the most desperate, devilish, and selfish campaign ever waged against humanity," and as "the despot whose insatiable egotism is drenching Europe with the blood of its workers and wage-earners." Herr Haase, speaking in the Reichstag on behalf of the German Social Democratic Party, said: "On behalf of my Party I wish to make the following declaration: 'The policy of imperialism is the cause of the entire world being at war, and of the peoples flinging themselves against each other and deluging Europe in a torrent of blood. The defenders of this policy will have to bear full responsibility before the world. The Social Democrats of Germany have combated this policy with all their strength, and at this very hour they combat it still, in union with their French brothers, who have always laboured to maintain peace. Our efforts have failed. We find ourselves in a state of war, and menaced with foreign invasion. It is no longer a question of the cause of the war; it is a question of the means whereby we can defend our frontier. But we have the right to think with sorrow of the millions of our fellow-countrymen who have been dragged, in spite of themselves, into this catastrophe.'"

The German Socialists have issued a manifesto ending with the following: "The ruling classes who in time of peace gag you, despise you, would use you as food for cannon. Everywhere must sound in the ears of those in power: 'Down with war! Long live the International Brotherhood of the peoples!'"

The Austrian Socialists have also issued a manifesto saying: "We repudiate all responsibility for this war. We know we are united with the organized working class of the whole world, and we hereby solemnly dedicate ourselves to the cause of International Social Democracy, to which we shall remain faithful during life, and devoted until death."

No! This is not a war of the peoples of Europe, but a war engineered by the foul cupidity of despicable war-machine contractors, acting through the Prussian military monomaniacs and their vicious influence over the Kaiser. But it is rendered possible, and solely rendered possible, by the criminal cowardice of the ruling cliques in each European nation, who, with any true courage in the cause of justice and sanity, would, years ago, have combined to stamp upon and annihilate this cursed canker of fomented hate and tainted profits, instead of fostering mutual suspicions and petty jealousies, thereby involving the necessity that, as the prime maniac raved progressively more and more, each nation must imitate his delirium even up to the approaches to national bankruptcy, and then, with self-satisfied imbecility, congratulate themselves if this inflated madness reached a one-, or a two-, or a three- "power standard"!

V.

“REASON” INSULTED BY SO-CALLED “AUTHORITIES,” AND EVEN NEGLECTED BY WELL-MEANING COUNSELLORS.

BY straining charity almost to the breaking-point, it is possible to offer only one shred of excuse for this neglect of those Governments not dominated by an obsessed delusionist ridden by a barbarism and a greedy partnership. This is, that their point of view is so close up to the conspiracies that they do not see them in their true perspective ; and that, as the military and naval authorities are blended with them in their councils, their light is refracted and bent so as to distort the image seen.

Such is, in my opinion, the explanation of the futile, and infantile, bickerings at the various Peace Conferences. These melancholy spectacles have made many of us wonder whether ordinary common-sense is for ever to be strangled by childish jealousies. These intermittent exhibitions resemble a lot of timid children each egging the other on to “firmly grasp the stinging nettle,” and, as usual, the outcome is plenty of taunts, lots of palaver, no courage, time wasted, humanity not yet convalescent. Valhalla must echo with ribald laughter at each performance.

But the present shocks of horror and degradation of humanity seem to have acted like the “lightning-stroke” in the “miraculous restoration of sight” cases, and cleared away the distortion, restored the perspective, and burnt the appalling truth into the people’s souls.

Fortunately, the reality has for some years past been appealing to the peoples, and spreading like an ever-accelerating tide throughout the nations. Especially was this the case—to their honour, be it said—among the workers and labouring classes ; but it was spreading widely among the rest of us also, to limits far beyond ordinary recognition, as it was often unavowed for fear of opprobrium. Those of us who have openly avowed it, and denounced war as a “futile, brutal, and subsidized atrocity,” have had to bear epithets of “pro-Boer,” “little-Englander,” cranks, and faddists. But in such a cause the bitterer the taunts, the greater the honour. I believe that the startling change in the national spirit is due largely to the open avowal of many who had not the courage to be articulate earlier.

This “tide of reason” would of itself, with a little longer time for growth, have rendered the present calamity impossible. And there is considerable evidence to show that this was recognized by the malicious plotters for the “militarists’ millennium,” who were thereby stampered into staking their all before they had completed their loading of the dice, thus accounting for the fortunate miscarriage of their atrocious swindle.

As the future welfare of the human race depends upon the complete stripping of every rag of disguise from these conspirators, no effort should be spared to show them up in their revolting nakedness. I will, therefore, give in a few extracts a *résumé* of evidence which will convict them out of their own mouths.

Of all the multitude of books hurriedly published (each of them being “the” book on the war—*vide* advert.) two are especially noteworthy in my opinion. These are *Germany’s Swelled Head*, by the late Dr. Emil Reich, and Count von Bernhardi’s *Germany and the Next*

War. Dr. Emil Reich published in 1907,¹ and gives a most interesting and accurate account of the growth of German "Weltpolitik," showing how this latest infant in "world-nations" had come out of the nursery with all the impetuosity, all the destructive propensities, and all the conceited delusions of a petted child, and with even less common-sense and rational development than that with which ordinary children leave their nurseries. Dr. Reich traces out convincingly that Germany must, to fulfil her hallucinations, force war upon England, and that all her efforts have been calculated for that event; but, like all authorities "under present conditions," Dr. Reich misses the essential truth that there is no solution except the observance of "rationalism" in politics. The last paragraph of his interesting book is: "It is in the hopes of rousing the British nation to this danger that the present little book is written. The Germans, the author holds, must expand, will expand; but ought not to be able to establish a new empire at the expense of the British Empire, so long as Great Britain, fully cognizant of the imminent danger of Germany's swelled head, prepares for the conflict both from the military and naval standpoint, let alone by means of judicious diplomacy. Late-comers must be satisfied with crumbs; if they get more, it is only because there is something radically wrong with the people who preceded them."

There you have it! The same old muddle-headed attempt to solve a psychological problem, involving the development intellectually, scientifically, and commercially of a finely educated nation. Never a suggestion that mutual co-operation all the world over would stimulate such higher evolution in each and all. No! For the discussion and solution of this question of how

¹ Dr. Reich wrote in 1904, and a mutual friend read the manuscript at his request.

to best develop the highest powers of individual man all the world over by the best means which can be thought out by universal co-operation and emulation, the world's "statesmen" have nothing to offer except an appeal from the highest to the lowest extreme in man's nature—*i.e.*, fangs, claws, and the delirium of blood!

They all point out that there is a very dangerous "mad dog of Europe," causing consternation in the European residential square. They meet and pretend to consult. But all they can do is to agree that each must go on raising higher and more costly fences all round their extensive properties, tangle themselves up with barbed wire, and continue a miserable and terrified existence, suffering from "jumps" by day and nightmares by night. Common-sense would have suggested that each should get his present gun and load it up carefully; then, for the sake of the Society for Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, they should have addressed soothing words to the rabid animal, such as "Good dog," etc., and, with an honest attempt to ensure fairness and even kindness, they should have attempted to administer an emetic so as to get that vile military stuff off his stomach, and followed this up with a soothing draught. Such startling sense in international treatments might have done wonders, as, besides its sanity, it would have all the force of an almost paralyzing, unexpected invention. However, should it have failed, then all and each would shoot the mad dog "on sight," without waiting for him to grow more rabid, bigger, and with added rows of teeth, like a temporary reversion to the shark stage. Dr. Reich published in 1907, and for seven years we have with sullen tempers refused to collaborate, and gone on with our insane alternative of barbed wire, etc., not recognizing that to-day's gun, if used in such a good cause and all combined for the mutual benefit of humanity,

is better than to-morrow's gun, or that of even distant to-morrows, bought just short of bankruptcy, through idiotic refusal to co-operate, and intended to be used individually and probably indiscriminately. The growing armaments of Europe (for "armaments" read "insanity," as in this department of politics these are interchangeable terms), and the awful waste of wealth and useful opportunities in times of peace, as well as the ghastly super-added welter of passion and murder in time of war, are due "actively" to the German military caste, and "passively" to the absence of bold sanity from the councils of nations.

As I regard the German Emperor as less blameworthy owing to the natural defect of Egomania, and Krupp and his international confederates as most criminal, as their ambition was only filthy lucre, I look upon this military class as a most interesting blend of inflated lunacy and criminal conspiracies. The lunacy part is the humorous idea that the Prussian is "IT" in every aspect, and the moral squint which turns every recognized "right" into an error, and every accepted "evil" into a beatitude. The "criminal" part is the actual scheming and putting into practice these immoral insanities. The most pathetically silly statements are made in Bernhardt's book, accompanied by an asterisk (*), and at the foot of the page just "(*) Treitschke" (or some other sufferer from the delusions), and poor Bernhardt thinks that this "asterisk" settles everything and defies refutation. It is sad evidence, and dangerous. Were it permitted, somebody in the future would produce still more fantastic eccentricities, and expect them to be believed because of "(*) Bernhardt"! The lunacy side of this "German infatuation" is easily proved from the reception of the works of widely-read so-called "authorities." Ludwig Woltman has claimed, with particulars, German blood

and credit for Raffael, Michelangelo, and right through history to his culminating silliness in "proving" that Jesus was really also a German! According to this, should any of us accomplish anything really clever, we should not only receive the present typically British snubbing of anything not mediocre, and the active opposition to anything which necessitates re-thinking of old questions, but we should be subjected to the added imposition of being claimed as "undoubtedly German"! This would be no sort of reproach if true, but would seem like an unnecessary addition to the present ill-treatment by our own nationality.

VI.

AMAZING—AND DANGEROUS DELUSIONS, NOT AS YET ENTAILING RESTRAINT IN AN ASYLUM.

BERNHARDI relies upon a man whom Viscount Bryce calls "the famous professor of history, Heinrich von Treitschke." Among other quotations from this writer Bernhardi gives the following (each with its (*) asterisk; and in my opinion this asterisk contains more sense than the quotations themselves):—

"God will see to it that war always recurs as a drastic medicine for the human race."

"A thousand touching traits testify to the sacred power of the love which a righteous war awakes in noble nations."

"A sacrifice made to an alien nation not only is immoral, but contradicts the idea of self-preservation, which is the highest ideal of a State."

"Among all political sins the sin of feebleness is the most contemptible; it is the political sin against the Holy Ghost."

And when "Germans had in the course of centuries grown accustomed to the degradation of being robbed of all political significance.....that idealistic generation" (Bernhardi) "was contented with the thought that no other people could follow the bold flights of German genius or soar aloft to the freedom of our world citizenship."

With all respect to Viscount Bryce, I think that

Treitschke has a better-earned claim to the title of "infamous professor of delusions and perverted morality."

Now for Bernhardi's brand of righteousness :—

"The inevitableness, the idealism, the blessing of war as an indispensable and stimulating law of development must be repeatedly emphasized."

"War is the greatest factor in the furtherance of culture and power."

"Efforts to secure peace are extraordinarily detrimental as soon as they influence politics."

"Fortunately these efforts can never attain their ultimate objects in a world bristling with arms,¹ where a healthy egotism still directs the policy of most countries."

"Efforts directed towards the abolition of war are not only foolish, but absolutely immoral, and must be stigmatized as unworthy of the human race."

"Huge armaments are in themselves desirable. They are the most necessary pre-condition of our national health."²

Now, either the man believes these things or he does not believe them, but desires to make others believe them and act upon them. In the former case he has no right whatever to be outside Bedlam; in the latter case even rudimentary justice would put him into gaol for the most immoral conspiracy ever contemplated.

Again : "The State's highest moral duty is to increase its power."

"The State is justified in making conquests whenever its own advantage seems to require additional territory."

"The State is the sole judge of the morality of its own action. It is, in fact, above morality; or, in other words, whatever is necessary is moral."

¹ Evidently "lifted" without acknowledgment from the gospel according to Krupp and his missionaries in all lands.

² *Ibid.*

He acknowledges that the ordinarily accepted ideas of "right and wrong" are necessary "within each State." So what is "moral" one foot on the Prussian side of their frontier is "immoral" one foot on the other man's side, and *vice versâ*. This is a lower morality for mankind, "made in Germany," than that which obtains in any monkey-house. Further, even Fagin does not assault or rob his own son, nor does the Artful Dodger burgle his mother's cellar. So far they obey Bernhardt's maxims. But he insists that "the State is justified in making conquests whenever its own advantage seems to require additional territory"! Why should not the Fagin State reap "advantage" from the Dodger State? Well, simply because there is a higher sense of "honour among thieves" than the "cultured military caste" observe in their own politics, and have plotted to inflict upon all the nations of the earth.

But the gospel of Bernhardt, Treitschke, and Co. has a further "message" to States—particularly "small States":—

"Weak nations have not the same right to live as the powerful and vigorous nation."

".....This is sufficiently exemplified by the pitiable existence of all small States; and every great Power that mistrusts itself falls victim to the same curse."

Where these statements are "ethical" they are only "daft"; but wherever they venture upon "fact" they are untrue. Norman Angell, whose "ethics" agree with "facts," and whose "facts" correspond with "truth," proves that if both these "axioms" of Bernhardt were turned inside out, so as to present their opposite aspects, they would then, and only then, be true.

I quote (*The Great Illusion*, p. 33, ed. 1913): "Thus, as a rough-and-ready though incomplete indication of the relative wealth and security of the respective States,

the Three per Cents. of powerless Belgium are quoted at 96, and the Three per Cents. of powerful Germany at 82; the Three and a-Half per Cents. of the Russian Empire, with its hundred and twenty million souls and its four million army, are quoted at 81, while the Three and a-Half per Cents. of Norway, which has not an army at all (or any that need be considered in this discussion), are quoted at 102. All of which carries with it the paradox that the more a nation's wealth is militarily protected, the less secure does it become.

"This is not the only basis of comparison, of course. Everyone who knows Europe at all is aware of the high standard of comfort of the small countries—Scandinavia, Holland, Belgium, Switzerland. Mulhall, in *Industries and Wealth of Nations*, p. 391, puts the small States of Europe with France and England at the top of the list, Germany *sixth*, and Russia, territorially and militarily the greatest of all, at the very end. Dr. Bertillon, the French statistician, has made an elaborate calculation of the relative wealth of the individuals of each country. The middle-aged German possesses, on the established average, nine thousand francs; the Hollander sixteen thousand."

How does Bernhardi explain these things? Does he consider that the fourteen per cent. inferiority of funds in Germany, below Belgium, is really compensated for by the antics of himself and the rest of the class of "cultured hooligans"? And does the "average German" feel satisfied that the Hollander has "missed a good thing" by having seven thousand francs more, when he might have invested it in the military swagger and inflated importance of a class of men whose "code of morals" is that explained in Bernhardi's book, and whose polished manners are daily taught in the subdued light of Zabern or the fierce lime-light of Louvain,

Reims, and "superior orders to attempt to outshine the Huns"?

Apart from material wealth, Viscount Bryce has pointed out what Switzerland has done for freedom. Why! it is even more than Germany has done against it, and it is impossible to value the efforts of Switzerland more highly.

As to art, poetry, and all the other finer and more valuable contributions to human happiness, each of these "weak nations," which "have not the same right to live" as Germany, might be exterminated to-day, and yet leave a record of noble names that a reconstituted Germany will have to work hard to equal before the millennium. Of course, I take it for granted that the German writers will not now make any violent claim to their recent "proofs" that every noted Belgian, Frenchman, Italian, Hollander, and all the other nations away back to Jerusalem, are really their own dearly beloved "German" brothers.

Bernhardi's reasoning and statements are monotonously wrong from every sane point of view; but they become nauseating in instances like the following: "Again, from the Christian standpoint, we arrive at the same conclusion. Christian morality is based, indeed, on the law of love. 'Love God above all things, and thy neighbour as thyself.' This law can claim no significance for the relations of one country to another, since its application to politics would lead to a conflict of duties.....Christian morality is personal and social, and in its nature cannot be political.....It tells us to love our individual enemies, but does not remove the conception of enmity. Christ Himself said: 'I am not come to send peace on earth, but a sword.' His teaching can never be adduced as an argument against the universal law of struggle. Combat, moral combat, is its very

essence.....Thus, according to Christianity, we cannot disapprove of war in itself, but must admit that it is justified morally and historically."

There! The only comment I can make upon this is to suggest to Bernhardi's publishers that they ought to bring out an edition of the Bible altered to agree with his doctrines without acrobatic contortions. And if they will accept a suggestion from me still further, I would advise that this "revised version" of the Bible be printed upon asbestos.

VII.

LUNACY IS "INFECTIOUS," AND REQUIRES STRICT RESTRAINT LIKE OTHER "INFECTIOUS DISEASES."

I SHALL insist again, at the risk of an accusation of "damnable iteration," upon the essential importance of showing up Bernhardi's book and similar productions (*i.e.*, Treitschke, etc.) in the true light. That this is necessary is proved by the following fact. Wishing to know if Bernhardi were also an armament manufacturer as well as an energetic selling agent, so that I might judge how much of his blame should be included under "lunacy" and how much under "criminality," I wrote to a man who has done some of the best work, and earned the gratitude of the people, in exposing the members of the "armament suction-ring." Apart from the implied rebuke to myself, I was amazed at his reply, of which the following is a copy: "I cannot say whether or not the great German publicist General von Bernhardi is or is not a shareholder in Krupps. The share-lists of this company are in no way accessible to inspection. There are evident signs, if you will read his book with other than utterly prejudiced pacifist or British eyes, that he is quite honest in his beliefs. Personally, I think it is, from their standpoint, quite the best and sanest exposition of the militarists' case that I have ever seen. I enjoyed reading it immensely."

Now, if such a keen and conscientious worker can call this book the "best and sanest exposition" of anything,

I fear for its influence upon ordinary men. I had not given him any criticism—from my view—of this book, and yet he replies: “if you will read his book with other than utterly prejudiced pacifist or British eyes”! I do not object to being called “pacifist,” even without it being softened down by the alternative of “British.” I welcome any such “badge,” which I am convinced is merited through sound reasons; but, fortunately for myself, the “eyes” with which I judge this matter are trained in other schools as well. They are not influenced by the horror of “spilled blood.” Twenty-eight years of hospital work enable one to look right through to the essential wound without the slightest impediment from any amount of blood around. Even my short experience of temporary charge of a large asylum destroys the plea that, because a man is “quite honest in his beliefs,” this fact is absolute proof of his fitness to be outside an asylum. These beliefs must be considered in their relation to the community at large. I have conversed in an asylum with men whose “honesty in their beliefs” was every bit as unimpeachable as, and more pathetic than, Bernhardi’s. But of all cases of delusions or homicidal madness I never met one so truly dangerous to the human race as Bernhardi and every one of his followers, who are “quite honest in their beliefs.” All the homicidal maniacs at present in all the asylums of Europe could not—had they been set perfectly free and uncontrolled—have involved civilization in such a disgraceful frenzy, or been instrumental in causing a tithe of the outrages and deaths involved in the present war. This rampant and unrestrained insanity is also responsible for the happiness destroyed through ceaseless anxiety; the wealth diverted from saving life to inflicting the most horrible and numerous deaths; the seduction of all science and invention to destroy life

and happiness when, rightly used, they would by now have rendered man the happy, prosperous, and contented lord of creation; and the abortion of man's one supreme gift of reason at the behest of animal-man's lust for gold, blood, or senseless swagger. All this has gone on from year to year, and from generation to generation. Neither the waste nor the degradation can be removed. Are you proud of its schemed and only possible "millennium" now materialized as the militarists' consummation of man's destiny? They are a mad race, and unfortunately their archaic delusions and bedecked struttings have amused us and beguiled us to the bankrupt intellect's habit of applauding or laughing without using our brains. Surely we can be sensible after such silliness has resulted in the present degrading catastrophe! Further, legal training has assisted my "pacifist or British eyes" to complete a practically "all-round" survey of this ghastly business. I take the basis of my opinions to be that man is the only animal which has that quality of "reason" which enables him to honestly consider past, present, and future events and theories, and to adjust those of the present so as to ensure the noblest development in the future that is possible, considering their building-up in the past. This mental and rational superiority gives him full power to effectually suppress or adequately control all those passions which he inherits from his animal ancestors, insofar as the best interests of the living race and the highest developments of the future race may be dependent upon such exercise of his highest attribute—namely, his "reason."

That is a statement of my outlook upon life and politics, and my honest opinion founded thereon concerning Bernhardt and the Prussian military caste is that "their policy, morality, ambitions, and arguments

are lunatic where they are not criminal, and criminal where they are not lunatic." It is no refutation to say that they are ordinary members of society, and that it is ridiculous to suggest that they are "lunatics." Now do not run off with an only partial recognition of what the word "lunatic" means. Cynically it can be said that we are "all lunatics," and some of us are only confined in asylums because the particular idea of any one man's lunacy interferes with what may be called the "popular" theories or those of the great majority. There is a lot of truth in that; and in my estimation the saddest thing is that this "popular majority" has not years ago voted that "militarism" is about the most dangerous brand of lunacy, and that it is as essential to compulsorily restrain it as it is to use disinfectants to poisoned wounds of the body. It is no use arguing that "these men are as sane as anybody else on every other possible subject." That has nothing to do with the matter at all; the whole question being, "Is their mental condition such that they may commit, or attempt to commit, such act or acts as will inflict injury upon other unoffending and innocent members of the community or race?" Go into any asylum, and you will find many inmates who appear to you to be as sane as anybody you ever met. You may be indignant about it, or you may simply wonder at it. Had you been provided with the one "key which actuates the broken lock in the one department of their brain," you would have let loose the delusion for which they were put under supervision. And I will guarantee that were you to search all the asylums of Europe, provided with all the "keys of all delusion-locks," you would not find an inmate whose retention was not based upon something infinitesimally less dangerous to humanity than that which is responsible for "militarism." "Militarism" is no less a

dangerous lunacy because the murder it desires is wholesale, and not content with the ambition of the ordinary "homicidal lunatic." Militarism has no more right to be "loose on the world" because it aims at slaying a whole weaker nation and annexing its territory than if it carried out the recognized "highway murder" or "sneaking theft." Militarism should not be able to escape the same restraint as any other distorted "science of crime" because it has gaudy uniforms and gold epaulets. Militarism should gain no mercy because of its "antiquity." This it shares only equally with scalping and cannibalism, and these are already upon our out-of-date "index expurgatorius." Finally, militarism ought not to be a "pampered uncertified lunatic" because many of us like to inflate our chests and yell that "WE (or anybody else) are the CHOSEN PEOPLE." Let us get down to true "reason," so that we can thereby prove our superiority to the rest of the animal creation. Froth, paint, and "make-believe" were good enough for the infancy of the human race; but surely we are old enough by now to talk and think in adult language. And one of the first questions to be determined with any claim to being "rational human beings" is the rational reconsideration of our present doctrines of "lunacy" and "criminality." Multitudes of people are put into asylums and prisons who could be made useful and harmless members of society by treatment and proper surroundings. And multitudes of people are free and unrestrained whose mental conditions and moral principles are poisonous to true humanity. In judging true social morality our law, our legislature, and most of ourselves have a most horrible squint, and the result is that our judgments as at present recorded would be ludicrously irrational were they not so fatal to social morality. The greatest social curse of the day is that people "will not THINK." It is not

“ thinking ” to mentally scan “ headlines ” and then turn out so-called “ opinions.” A very little more evolution and animals will do this much. Honest thinking means honest use of trained, and not aborted, reason ; and we should all do our best to ensure that this gets a fairer chance in the future.

VIII.

MORAL COWARDICE.

ANYBODY who feels inclined to scoff at my diagnosis of "militarism" as a dangerous monomania is, of course, at liberty to do so, and proves by this very process that he is one of those who cannot "think" a subject deeply enough to get down beyond the prejudices of custom, glamour, or selfish interest. Any single one of the old "inspired" supporters of the "Holy Inquisition" would have adopted the same attitude towards any who preached its vile cruelty. Those who upheld slavery as "planned in, and approved of by, the Bible" were convinced that the abolitionists had "left their senses." Every nation with the exception of the military-braggart Prussian is ashamed of having up to recent times maintained that any "debt of honour" is paid by permitting the debtor to stick a knife into the injured party, or the aggrieved person committing the same atrocity upon his opponent. Two blacks never make a white. And no wrong is cancelled by adding murder or other crime to the account. It makes no difference if you dress the thing up with whatever romance can be derived from fancy costumes, early morning appointments, secrecy, seconds, surgeons, rapiers, or clinging "beauties and farewells," and then dub the silly thing a "duel." We all see the truth thus far, but the process of futile "imitation" thinking comes in with puffed chest and rattling head if we multiply this single imbecility by two hundred thousand or more on each side, and the "glory" (!) increases with the

multiplication table. Instead of theatrical preliminaries of "seconds and choice of weapons," etc., we spend all the genius of every inventor, and all the national wealth required for abolition of slums, starvation, and disease, upon the worst possible devilish machines for mutual murder. "Glorious Victory!"—"Entire Army Corps wiped out!" Do not blow off about this until you have really used your brain on the subject. Remember we are not taking any sides at present. I do not care whose "Army Corps" it was. But I care to the utmost limit of my nature for those five to ten thousand corpses. Each one the pivot of as much joy and sorrow as myself. Each one the shrine of as much love and hope. Each one the embodiment of as much future hardship and misery as my own family and friends could suffer. Each mangled frame as manly as my own. Each ghastly fragment only a counterpart of its duplicate in me. Each brain with its possible treasure for human advancement, a monument of lustful robbery of the race. Each sight on the field a burning disgrace even to an anthropoid ape, and a damning proof of the shallowness of our civilization and the hypocrisy of any—and even of no—religion. To say that this is not a "madness" is a blasphemy against humanity of which we, as a generation, will be thoroughly ashamed in the coming years. This barbaric delusion is buttressed by its apologists with nauseous cant—"Bernhardism, true brand in Prussia; watered-down brand for foreign consumption."

"It improves the race as nothing else can!" Nonsense! It chooses out the best men of the race, and adds their virility to the future by murdering them! Any idiot could devise "physical exercises" which would add more to any nation than thousands of corpses of their choicest soldiers. Another fraudulent excuse is that "it develops the highest qualities such as courage,"

etc. Again, "Nonsense." I am one of the last to belittle our soldiers' qualities, and, of course, courage and self-sacrifice are admirable; but every incident of these noble human traits in war grieves me as I think: "Had that noble effort been expended towards saving life instead of murdering it, what might the human race not have already attained?" It takes a higher form of courage and self-sacrifice to "save" life than to "take life," and it is a form attainable only by man; while the martial courage is at its highest in a cage of hyenas. The man who enters a burning building to save life needs more courage than a whole regiment of men who mutually sustain each other and are carried along with inflamed passion. Were it possible to reduce in a crucible the true metal of a doctor, or nurse, or other devoted worker who goes out to minister to a plague-stricken area, you would obtain far more of the pure, precious metal than you would from a similar process with an entire army in the field. To jump into the shark-infested sea to rescue a comrade is a braver and finer deed than "to capture a battery of guns" in a delirious charge. We are the merest children in "perspective." Anybody who dares to think outside the ordinary "customs" is regarded as "eccentric" at the least. Few have the courage to get higher up the mountain of thought so as to obtain a broader outlook, which shows that all the interests and difficulties which looked like insurmountable hills from the valley are, when regarded as a panorama from the higher level, only small and petty inequalities which through this cleared vision can easily be adjusted one to another like a picture puzzle. People are so terrified of holding any opinion which may be "unpopular." This is a fatal mistake. Its "unpopularity" is its greatest evidence for truth, just as any decision of an arbitrator which is equally criticized by both defendant and plaintiff

must be the just and happy mean. Any man who has no opinions or theories with which the "man-in-the-street" can quarrel is only a "diluent" in the human race. He represents the "water" in a medicinal mixture. Nobody objects to the taste of him, and he does nobody any harm, nor any good. It is the other atoms of some active ingredient which make the remedy of any value. Whether it be acceptable in flavour or bitter and revolting, still to it belongs all the praise of improvement, and the transitory popular hatred is in reality its greatest hope. Those of us who have spoken against the theory of "war" see with joy the national conscience painfully climbing the hill of thought and getting glimmerings of the broader outlook. At the time of the Boer War one word produced an almost epileptic attack, with the usual frothing and uncontrolled "mental" struggles. These struggles have gradually calmed down, until to-day I am told on all sides the amazing "statement of the case": "Of course nobody can defend the real idea of war. We cannot think of it without horror; but it is inevitable. What is the use of discussing it and lacerating our feelings when we cannot help it?" There you are! The very essence of mental and moral cowardice. All that is necessary is to have the courage to look the thing full in the face, and not bury your head in the sands of ignorance and cowardice. Looked at fairly and squarely, the policy of settling any single question of abstract justice, opinion, belief, or morality by mutilation and murder of your opponent's body is simply lunacy. It is no use saying it is done by every nation. It is also done by all tigers, hyenas, and beasts of prey. The difference is that they have a valid excuse, while the human race has none, unless it claims that it is only on the same level as hyenas, etc.

War is no more "inevitable" than cannibalism. The

fault is not in "war" itself, any more than it was in "cannibalism" in itself. The entire fault is in those human minds which can regard either or both of these "policies," and then dare to say that either one or both are "inevitable." These people are unjust libellers of the human race. They take their repugnance to think about revolting consequences of their beliefs, and their cowardice which fears "advanced thinking"; and, glueing these two defects on to "war," they say "It is inevitable." Let the awful carnage, the uncounted tears of bereavement, the agonies of innumerable broken hearts, the disgrace of our picked and noblest manhood so beguiled by the decayed products of the ages that they must dethrone their reason so that "they know not what they do" under the name of "glory"—let these appeal to every individual in every civilized race to look with enlightened eyes at man's enthralldom by barbaric remnants, and resolve that henceforth this courage, this self-sacrifice, this treasure, this nobility, shall fill man's cup with refreshing nectar, not make it overflow with a traitorous and deadly poison.

IX.

“IMMORALITY” IS ENTIRELY A “DISEASE OF THE MIND.”

“BY their fruits ye shall know them.” The blasted tree teaches us of the lightning. The ruined city instructs us about the earthquake. The punctured wound tells us of the assassin’s knife, and the emaciated corpse of the cancer’s destruction. The bloody battlefield, the heaps of slain, the agonies of the dying, the groans of those who almost crave for death to end their sufferings, the ruined homes and the sorrows of women and children—these explain to us, in language which cannot be mistaken, “War.”

It is essential that we should recognize that “crime” itself is not in the slightest degree an attribute of the “body” of man. It is absolutely a physical and visible concretion of some diseased mental process. The power of the blow with which an assassin thrusts his dagger into his victim’s heart has nothing whatever to do with his physical anatomy. No blame attaches to the bones, muscles, or nerves of his arm. All these were absolutely indifferent to the end of their activities. They would as willingly have pulled a child from the fire, snatched the man from an approaching train, or given alms to a beggar. The entire fault was confined to *the brain which ordered the action*. The nerves, as the “intelligence department,” stood ready to forward each command sent to the millions of cells, each a separate unit, yet all combined in “companies,” “battalions,” and “army

corps," until they formed the army of the "biceps," and the armies of the other muscles all co-operating in any plan of campaign. Shall all these millions of willing workers exert their strength to save that child from the burning house, or shall they devote their energy to the murder of one or thousands of human beings, each possessing within his own kingdom duplicates of these armies? The question is answered solely by the brain which controls that particular "army." If a work of salvation is accomplished, to the brain is the praise. If the work is murder, then it is the brain alone that is damned. This was the criminal who schemed the murder. This alone promulgated the order. This alone reaps the horror. The muscles, the strength, the cunning adjustments of joints, have no share in the iniquity. They would as gladly have proffered brotherly aid to the opponents. But, no! The diseased brain sent out a diseased order, and the result is naturally corruption. "You cannot make a silk purse out of a sow's ear." Neither can you make a good act out of a diseased conscience. But, fortunately, neither can you make darkness or disease out of sunlight.

Now let us glance at Belgium, France, Austria, Servia, Russia, and East Prussia. Carnage everywhere. Horror upon horror piled until the sun of sympathy is blotted out and the wells of sorrow run dry. "By their fruits ye shall know them." *Here* are the *fruits* in plenty! Now, then, deduce the author. Anybody who thinks that I am in any way dealing personally, and implying any motive to any living man, is either wilfully untruthful or incompetent to enter into a discussion. The soldiers themselves are not to blame, any more than the cells of the battalions of muscles. The officers and the staffs are no more culpable than the nerves which transmitted the orders. The whole fault is in the brain of civilization—the "national conscience." The various Govern-

ments have no larger share in this blame than has each citizen who does not strive to extirpate the foul disease now dominating that brain. Should any man, in his opinion that "war is inevitable," say that I am attacking our heroic soldiers, I reply that he lies. I am attacking *him* personally and his diseased brain-cell, which is his infinitesimal contribution to the "national conscience." I accuse *him* of his active part in the diseased manifestations, and I ask *him* to state publicly whether he is really proud of these heaps of dead and the other horrors? I ask this man if he will not at once purge his "national brain-cell" of this poison and make it healthy, so that it may act as a stimulus to, and a focus of, healing throughout the national conscience? He will do no good by simply refusing to recognize that these corrupt products must be caused by a diseased organism. Nor will it be any use to maintain that the disease is so chronic and widespread that it can never be cured. Similar shirkers and cowards said just these things about the plague and the small-pox in past years. Were they alive now, they would see that a pessimistic prophet is about the biggest fool there is. Of course, even when the majority of "national consciences" are cured, there will probably be one or two hopeless idiots who refuse to be treated or cured. At any rate, when there is a wide sanity, any real lunatic gets restrained and put out of mischief. It is only when each individual is himself a lunatic that any who have attacks of homicidal madness, or delirium tremens, are thought to be so little worse than themselves that the milder lunatics do not see—or will not co-operate—that these maniacal outrages must be restrained at any cost; and all necessary violence for this purpose is not only permissible, but the only crime in the matter is the neglect to take measures for a compulsory cure or permanent incarceration. This is the

position in the year of grace 1915, and after more centuries of "civilization" than most of us have years of existence. We cannot deny that the disease exists, that it is poisonous, and that it ought to be cured. But with the usual lazy mental processes—the shirking of any true "thinking," the cowardice of either "thinking or speaking ahead of the fashion"—we refuse to apply to this and all the other troubles the only and insupplantable antiseptic of "reason." It is getting merely a suggestion of a chance now when people say: "Of course war cannot be defended; but what can we do?" What can they do? That is a silly question. They can at least have one spark of courage, and rebel against the encouragement of what they know "cannot be defended." The "national conscience" which rules these matters is nothing more or less than a huge mosaic of the individual fragments of individual consciences. Why do these people whine of impotency? Why applaud a crime with silence? Surely common humanity ought to impel them to cure their own individual premises, so that at least there shall be no accusation of infection or neglect on their part. They can also stimulate the application of the disinfectant of "reason" by all those with whom they come into contact. A few healthy foci of healing will soon heal the most extensive wound. Can such a person not at least be one such "focus"? The foul ulcer is chronic, the mental disease has persisted long; but with honest endeavour, and the conscientious application of this antiseptic of "reason," all the bacteria can be exterminated in a very short period, and the wounds will heal kindly and painlessly, the mental condition become quieter and brighter, and by the time that the gashes now inflicted have knit together again the human race may enter upon a brighter career, made "whole and in its right mind."

X.

SYMPTOMS OF INSANITY—WITH “FIRST AID” HINTS.

LUNACY in excelsis. Murder as the finest art. Outrage as a science. Devilment as morality. These—and only these, with no trace of any redeeming ingredient—constitute Prussian militarism.

In the rotten moral manure-heap of the Prussian military caste this poisonous weed grows with the rapidity of a spreading fungus. In other nations it is “not indigenous,” but an “imported variety,” transplanted because of the fictitious “impossibility” of any possible combination of “sanitary inspectors” being able to burn the heap of putrid filth in which it flourishes in its native habitat. It is imported and planted because of the obsession that poison can be cured only by more poison. It is cultivated not through enthusiasm, but through terror. The saddest reflection is that petty pride and customary jealousies have permitted many opportunities to slip away when it might have been exterminated—perhaps at a great cost, but still at a sacrifice insignificant compared with that which is now essential owing to its subsequent “unofficially-recognized” and “home-forced” rank growth.

One ray of comfort is still discernible, and that is that the spores of this poisonous fungus have not destroyed the German nation as a whole. The great mass of that nation loathes it as heartily as ourselves. The recognition of this is one factor which helped to decide the

"imps of the corruption-heap" into flinging their poisonous weed broadcast over Europe, hoping thus to disseminate its seeds throughout the cleaner soil of other nationalities. This is no time for regretting past mistakes. This noxious weed must be exterminated and uprooted. Its natural manure-heap must be burnt to utter destruction. No sacrifice in money or blood is too great for this consummation.

Those of us who are too old for active service can still do valuable service, and if we do this honestly we serve our generation as nobly and efficiently as any man. We may not be qualified to command a battleship or navigate an ocean liner. We may not even be competent to unfurl the sails or launch a lifeboat. But can we not do something towards drawing up the "chart" necessary for every mariner? Can we not indicate upon the plan the dangerous shoals, and mark the past wrecks as a warning? Can we not indicate the currents, with their directions and powers? Can we not show how the beneficent "trade" winds may bear us all along in the warmth of international brotherhood? Above all, can we not thunder forth in the blackest type on our chart the inhuman folly of "showing-off" (or permitting any comrade to play the fool by such senseless swagger), and playing with the commencing eddies of that seductive, ever-accelerating whirlpool of militarism, whose earliest indications are pleasing, leisurely, circumferential eddies, which, when once entered, inevitably suck the national ship nearer and nearer, with madly increasing velocity, until finally no power on earth or sea can save it from being engulfed in that terrifying vortex whose whirling base is "rival armaments," and whose apex is deep down in hell and destruction?

There is useful work outside the fighting-line, and I desire to add my calculations and my estimates of the

dangerous currents to the "new political navigation chart" which must be drawn up after the crushing proof of the absolute worthlessness of the present "rules for navigators," and the unavoidable calamities resulting from incompetent skill in cartography and criminal defiance of every rule of human reason.

And if any one of us, even in what may be misjudged to be the "backwater of our inactivity," can discover a submerged or incorrectly charted rock in the path of navigation, or can demonstrate more accurate soundings and effects of cross currents, who shall say that his contribution to the highest future of the human race is less honourable, less valuable, or to be more lightly esteemed than that of any man now battling in the armies of justice and common humanity? I desire to deal with two more questions—namely, "Apart from the present paroxysm of mad passion and murder, what have been, and are, the effects of militarism upon the advancement and ennoblement of the human race? Have these effects been blessings or blastings?" And, "What can be done in the future so to mould thought and politics as to ensure the reign of 'reason' and the death of crime and insanity, whether in rags in the police-courts and vagrant wards, or decked out in Court costume in the world's 'Diplomatic Circles'?"

(a) *The Beatitudes of Militarism.*

If the deluded braggarts who insisted upon "a place in the sun" really meant what they said, I should be the last to interfere with their fastest dispatch, as the destination is hot enough even for my selection on their behalf. But what they really mean is that they intend to get "between the sun and all other nations." Their pathetic delusion is twofold: firstly, that "they alone are the children of the sun, and all the rest of us denizens

of the shadow"; and, secondly, "that all the rest of us are such born fools as to allow any such childish lunatics to impose their self-inflations upon us." The word "childish" here applies to their intellectual development, and does not deny that a "childish delusion" may go along with a "devilish ingenuity."

According to the Prussian military chart, their voyage takes them to every imagined "blessed isle with fragrant blossoms and luscious fruits." This is the "alias," the true botanical name being "dead sea apples."

The "preliminary announcement" of their Great World's Tour (as issued through Messrs. Bernhardt and Co., Unlimited) contains the following alluring prospects: "War, in opposition to peace, does more to arouse national life and to expand national power than any other means known to history."

A deceased partner of the firm (known as Frederick the Great) wrote: "War opens the most fruitful field to all virtues, for at every moment constancy, pity, magnanimity, heroism, and mercy shine forth in it; every moment offers an opportunity to exercise one of these virtues."

A sleeping-partner (Wilhelm von Humboldt) also helps the advertisement with the following "unsolicited testimonial": "I recognize in the effect of war upon national character one of the most salutary elements in the moulding of the human race."

Quite an entertaining prospectus! Personally I desire to confirm every word in the quaint certificate of the Frederick whom somebody called "Great," but with this important and qualifying addition—namely, that the opportunities for the exercise of all these virtues are almost unlimited, as he knew by experience, since every single "opportunity of the moment" had been criminally made by himself during the actually preceding moment

of his brutality and murder in his wars; and that he and his co-workers in the vineyard of "gathering opportunities" certainly did enormous execution in the "manufacture of calls for help from all the virtues"; but they were too busy, too much "otherwise engaged," to attend to anything beyond the blackguardly end of the business.

I believe that another edition of this prospectus of the "Pleasure Cruise of the Prussian Galleon to the Sun" (capital "S") has been brought out by Bernhardt under the title of *How Germany makes War*. I have not read it, as from day to day an enlightening "summary" is given in the press; and the chapters headed "Louvain," "Rheims," "Salins," and in fact the whole production, leave such a beastly taste in the mouth that the sooner we close the volume the better, so as to send it out to be burned by the common hangman.

XI.

THE FRUITS OF "MILITARISM" AND A HOPE.

MILITARISM would scarcely exist to-day but for bribery and corruption. The great mass of every civilized nation has evolved too far to be obsessed by worship of the Juggernaut of brute force. Even the mass of the German people have higher morals than militarism, and did not desire war. The awful calamity is the work of the powerful capitalist armament-mongers acting through the backward evolution of the brains of the Prussian race, in which the advance from the primitive ape becomes less and less the higher one ascends in their "social scale," until in their top, or idolized, class of "Military Junkers" it is doubtful whether the ape has not the advantage. The Turk is also military from pure laziness to get anything by honest labour, if it can be robbed from somebody else's honest toil. Also the Mexican is military more from the glamour of a sombrero, a mustang, and a war-whoop, worked up into a theatrical display, and used like a gambler's trick at cards, to "bluff" the other man.

The true "villain of the piece" is Krupp, and the others of his gang: "head office Essen, branch establishments in every quarter of the globe." It will be an essential part of the educational curriculum for any true patriot who will help the "new diplomacy" to study the international coils of this "Armament Boa-constrictor." (Probably the best of many books is *The War Traders*, by G. H. Perris.) I cannot now go into this phrase further than to indicate that the mean sale of their respective countries, so that each country can "buy itself

back" into supposed safety by giving them further huge contracts and profits, is the groundwork of their existence. It is worth while for Krupp to run a free hotel at Essen, at a cost of over £20,000 per annum, for the accommodation of the representatives of those countries who have contracts under fulfilment. Bribery, secrets, and champagne flow with equal liberality as a minor gift of the "good fairy Militarism"! The evidence in the Krupp trial (and here I desire to pay homage to the courage of Dr. Liebknecht) proved the existence of a universal web of blackguardly swindling, with owned and subsidized press to "lie to order." The recent scandals in Japan also were due to bribery from this native country. But we must recognize the danger to ourselves through the extension of this vile conspiracy to our own country—the engineering of the "Dreadnought panic," not through patriotism, but through false information supplied (as afterwards confessed to by a "tout") to prominent members of each House of Parliament. Also the easy sliding into the seat of "director" of one or other armament firm for any admiral, general, or past member of the council of defence who will accept the invitation to step on the slippery slope, raises the blush of shame to the cheeks of all who value honest dealing.

That militarism is not a school of nobility or morality is proved by the atrocities of the German officers and troops in Belgium, as they ought to be "top scholars" owing to the thoroughness of their education in this school. It is also proved by the disgusting ambition and code of morals of the headmaster, as condensed in his "parting advice" to out-Hun the Huns. I think that here is a good opportunity of registering my protest against the common comparison of the German army to the Huns, and the Kaiser to Attila. It is grossly unfair to the Huns.

That militarism is fatal to honesty is proved by the Krupp and Japanese scandals, to mention nothing which could offend militarists nearer home.

That militarism slays truth is proved by the carefully-concocted lies in subsidized, and also in unsuspecting, newspapers.

That militarism debases the human race and turns evolution back to that of epochs of antiquity, the horrifying sight of Europe at present establishes. That militarism blots out love and happiness, the crowds of weeping women and fatherless children testify with their anguish.

That militarism defrauds the entire progress of mankind, the lavishness of wealth, science, and invention, cultivated solely for bloody massacres, and the studied starvation of all developments in the direction of usefulness, render indisputable. In every single activity of militarism it is devilish and degrading; and in every passive quality it is defrauding and damning to civilization.

The building of one single Dreadnought cancels the abolition of miles of slums. One "bang" of one of the much-belauded guns—even if its charge falls harmlessly into the sea—burns up the wages of a deserving and honest workman for anything between three and six years, according to whether he is highly skilled or an unskilled labourer. One week of the present war costs more than one year's benefit of the Old Age Pensions Act. At the end of the war the only things to be shown will be devastated countries, ruined homes, fields humped with huge mounds of buried dead; tears enough to drown all happiness, sorrow sufficient to blot out the sun, and sufferings only comparable to the tortures of hell. It is almost a mockery of language to call this monster a "lunacy." There is no word which can embody at once

the madness, the cruelty, and the degradation which are its very life-blood. Speech lags hopelessly behind, and imagination reels at the contemplation. Yet we dare to allude to humanity as "civilized"! Some even mutter in their delirium that "all is for the best in this best of all possible worlds." Were this true, it would be a mercy if our universe could be exploded, so as to end the blasphemous claim.

But there is a "silver lining" even to this terrifying cloud; and, as we are now passing through the darkest hour in human history, many of us are stirred with hope for the dawn of a day brighter than man has ever known before. A day when the "War-god is dethroned," where the sun shall shine clearly and not "through a glass darkly," a glass blood-coloured and obscured with the foul images of hatred and lust. A day when it will be impossible for moral imbeciles to set the fashions. A day when men shall recognize that each man is equally divine with any other man. A day when it shall be accounted noble to do good, to be honest, to "love thy neighbour as thyself." A day when to succour those afflicted will be an ambition, and when even the thought of oppression and cruelty will be a nightmare. A day when an imaginary line across the face of earth cannot, by the idiotic expedient of calling it a "frontier," automatically turn every blessing into a curse, every spark of love into hate, and every impulse of nobility into an emotion which would be a disgrace to a devil. In this coming dawn, and with the growing light, men shall see aright. Men shall be brothers. Women shall be sisters. Children shall be the treasures whom we shall guard and cherish with our love, knowing that, as we bring them up to manhood, strong to do right, noble to do good, valiant to crush wrong, so shall we leave behind us the best and highest heritage for the ages which shall yet be.

XII.

THE RETURN TO SANITY.

(b) *What can be done in the future so to mould thought and politics as to ensure the reign of "Reason"?*

FIRMLY convinced as I am that "Militarism" is the ultimate term in that series of criminal "lunacies" which commences with kleptomania and progresses through "homicidal" on towards the "wholesale homicidal mania" which works for "War," I am abundantly cheered by the glorious burst of rational sunshine which has suddenly suffused the political horizons of every one of our Colonies, as well as the neutral nations and the Allies. If the world was terrified at the incredible lunacy of European war, it has been equally delighted at the spontaneous outburst of Colonial loyalty. No person rejoices more than I do at this manifestation. I consider that it is a grander and higher emotion than "loyalty to our Empire." This latter is a "lesser term," and is included within that deeper and finer impulse of "hatred of the lunacy of 'war'" and all its bestial attributes. This is proved through the fact that the same bond of purpose binds us to other nations as well as to our own colonies. The neutral nations of Europe, and, best of all, our American cousins, are all irresistibly impelled to join in this "new faith" which shall move mountains from our future path, even while they refrain from further extension of the bloody battlefield.

It is a "mixed world" in which we live! No sooner do I bound with the eager hope for the progress in the

new free and open sunlight of peace (after the past grovelling in subterranean policies which have ended in this terrible charnel-house in which the nations now struggle) than I am rebuffed into humility by the disgrace which hammers itself into my brain with a rhythm like booming cannon: "When Reason was an infant, ye cast her forth from your political mansion. Now ye have had to well-nigh ruin these proud mansions with devilish machines and human sacrifice in order that this same 'Reason' may enter in through the breach, and become an honoured guest! Oh, fools! fools!"

Critics may say: "The time is not yet for considering the future. Wait till the War is over." I reply that "there is no time like the present." The only better times are past; neglected, scorned. Such an argument is fit only for shirkers or cowards. There is no "disloyalty" if, when actively treating a case of delirium tremens, one utters warnings against the abuse of alcohol. A medical officer of health is not "disloyal" because, during an epidemic of cholera, he insists upon strict measures to prevent the spread of the disease, and resolutely carries out sanitary measures to render future epidemics impossible. A surgeon is not "disloyal" if, while amputating a mangled limb, he proffers advice as to how the original calamity might have been avoided, and how the wounds might have been saved from subsequent infection. Neither does a physician merit denunciation if, while soothing a hopeless consumptive, he spreads the knowledge of how this human scourge may be mitigated.

Each one of us ought to accept it as the most solemn duty which has ever devolved upon him, to aid in every possible manner the formation among the democracies of every nation of one absolute rule, the disobedience, the denial, the shirking or the questioning of which rule will not be for one moment tolerated in the future, either by

monarch, minister, or any member of that governing directorate which may have various names in different countries.

This rule is : "International Politics shall in the future be carried on as openly, subject to as free discussion, and upon the same principles, as domestic politics. Any sign of jealousy or unfair dealing, or neglect of favourable opportunities for mutually advantageous co-operation, shall not be tolerated in foreign relations, any more than in questions affecting national politics alone." And as a personal guide to the people not to betray the new policy : "It is essential to recognize that honest politics can only be founded upon the one basis—namely, 'Do not to others what ye would not that they should do unto you.'" And also note, that nobody with any true conscience would continue to maintain that the word "others" can be chopped off anywhere you like, provided you label your idiotic margin a "frontier."

Up to the present the European nations have each insisted that in all political questions affecting their own limited areas the "people shall rule." Even when the Government is corrupt their power for mischief is limited and under more or less control. But, with amazing stupidity, all these nations have carefully selected "foreign relationships and complications," the most difficult, the most pregnant with disaster, and covering unlimited areas, as that department where they will "stake their all" upon three or four cards at the most out of the whole pack !

The Prussian armament-mongers could do little comparatively to ruin Germany's internal economy, and with this proposed control over foreign policies their *raison d'être* would have been gone, and they would have died through inanition. But here was a united band of lunacy and criminality, with *carte blanche* to be the

greatest blackguards to all other nations, and the greatest swindlers to their own. We cannot be surprised that they have surpassed themselves in the efficiency of their accomplishments. THIS is the "second law of nature" in the new dispensation. Reason has urged it with increasing pleading. Henceforth it is established, and no "closed circle," whether of wise men or sycophants, shall hold the destinies of nations at their mercy.

Germany will find that monomaniacs cannot make true calculations. These Prussian autocrats "judged others in their own measures," and, as their "measures" are rotten, the result was disastrous for the German nation. These men's ideas of "colonial empire" are summed up in a speech made by the theologian Lezius to a numerous and sympathetic audience of professors and students of Protestant theology, in which he advised that the Prussian Poles should be treated like Chinamen, and then continued: "Solomon has said, 'Do not be too good; do not be too just.' The Polish press should be simply annihilated. All Polish societies should be suppressed without the slightest apology being made for such a measure.....Especially should no consideration whatever be shown to anything relating to the Poles. The Constitution should be altered with regard to the latter. The Poles should be looked upon as helots. They should be allowed but three privileges: to pay taxes, serve in the army, and shut their jaws!" This is their mildest brand as stated through so-called "theology"!

These Prussians got the surprise of their lives when they found that British colonies were nurtured upon love, and not hate. They had speculated their all on civil war in Ireland, revolt in South Africa, and mutiny in India. Poor, deluded wretches! Their distorted brains could not grasp the possibility of gratitude for freedom, even if not fortified by hatred of their own

brutalities. It was an egregious error. And it was a rotten clique of such immoral men who ruled the destinies of a great nation, and involved them, with millions of others, in one huge sacrifice of carnage, solely for the destruction of this clique and the liberation of the German nation from actual domination, and other nations from the dangers of its damnable policies. This military oligarchy must be destroyed utterly, until there is not one single stone of its fortress left for shelter.

But we must also, as united democracies, see to it that the real "devil" in the machine is also exorcised. Krupp and all his gang, all his fellow conspirators, all his agents, and all his imitators in every land, must be cast forth as devils. There is no safety while they are not exterminated. There will always be weak, ambitious, and unprincipled men to listen to their seductive tongues, and civilization has no time in future to watch their evil operations. We shall be too busy accomplishing all those beneficent reforms which their insatiable greed has strangled up to now. Out with them! Tear up their cunning plans for the deification of barbarism! Smash their factories for the perfection of wholesale murder! And crush their power for fomenting lying, hate, and all uncharitableness.

I want to emphasize with my greatest earnestness the absolutely essential point that the "people" of this and every other civilized country must sacrifice every other consideration to the one object of the "death of militarism beyond any possible hope of resurrection." For this purpose all trace of "secret diplomacy" or dodging of full popular control must entail political annihilation for any man—no matter how glorious his past record may be. Does anybody believe that the German "people" knew that on June 14 last all arrangements for coaling German war vessels were completed? This date is two

weeks BEFORE the Sarajevo murders, and proves another "lie" in German diplomacy. Do the Austrian "people" know that their Government had sent notices calling Austrian reservists in South Africa to the colours also BEFORE these murders? Both these "peoples" have been fooled, and secrecy was to prevent these peoples having any voice in their own destinies.

Another warning. Mr. Churchill said in his speech at Liverpool on September 11, 1914: "In the next twelve months the number of great ships that will be completed for this country is more than double the number that will be completed for Germany—(cheers)—and the number of cruisers three or four times as great. (Cheers.) Therefore I think I am on solid ground when I come here to-night and say that you may count upon the naval supremacy of this country being effectively maintained as against the German Power for as long as you wish. (Cheers.)"

We require a better "diplomacy" than this in the future. Before this war is permitted to close we must get our heaviest foot on the neck of Prussian militarism so firmly and solidly that we can safely lift the other foot high enough to effectively stamp upon any attempt to supplant it with any brand of militarism either in England or any other country. This can be done by sanity and reason. It will be inevitably thwarted by any such brag or bluster. These things accomplished, insist upon the eradication of false ideals in national education. Teach the young that courage can save life, and not destroy it. Teach them that to be just to others is nobler than to cheat them or jockey them out of their rights by "clever diplomacy." Tell them that a "hero" is a man who does much for the benefit and enlightenment of mankind, not the man who engineers the slaying of his fellows. Build healthy houses for the poor, not

engines of destruction. Make the lives of the workers happy, and do not embitter their path with mutilated or slain fathers and brothers. Give them as guide the motto, "Do unto others as ye would they should do also unto you"; not, "My country wrong or right, and devil take all foreigners."

I know that many are inclined to scoff because England is "fighting for liberty by the side of Russia." I know that there is much cause for distrust in Russia's past history, and it has been bitterly given forth by a manifesto of the Russian Socialists during this war. The "brighter day" is dawning also for Russia. Judge not any man a hypocrite until you have given his reformation a fair trial. It was this same Czar of Russia who on August 24, 1898, addressed a rescript to the nations inviting international discussion of the means of assuring a durable peace for all peoples of the world. No other ruler has done such an outstanding deed of honour. No other emperor, or king, or cabinet, has "dared to be wise." If "charity covers a multitude of sins," this one act of the Czar has placed him upon a pinnacle from which he cannot be dethroned, although we may admit that many unsightly things in the foreground detract from the beauty of the monument. This one act of the Czar opened the gates to reason and justice. It is no fault of his that the childish jealousies and the criminal neglect of seizing the opportunity caused the representatives of the twenty-six nations who attended the first Hague Conference on July 29, 1899, to bang the gates again in the face of "Reason," who stood pleading for admission. Had others possessed the same courage as the Czar, we should have been spared the subsequent degradations. Had even several of the nations represented refused to listen to reason, with honesty and good faith the others could by unity

have forced sanity upon the mad ones. Oh! the pity of it!

In the present lamentable condition of international morality, it may be more necessary to outstrip any possible opponent's preparations for wholesale murder, but it is not one whit less degrading than it would be to sottishly drink ourselves into delirium tremens because our neighbour was a hopeless alcoholic. Neither would it be any more necessary had the twenty-four nations who, at the First Hague Conference desired temperance, possessed enough moral courage to sink childish jealousies, and pass, and unitedly enforce, a "Prohibition Law."

The true blame now lies not upon the unfortunate dipsomaniac, but upon those who, through such moral cowardice, refused to co-operate in the perfectly feasible object of making and enforcing such regulations as they well knew were not only essential for the protection, happiness, and progress of the whole human race, but were also absolutely indispensable in the best interests of the deluded sufferer himself.

When the first Hague Conference met, the combined war budgets of the six Great Powers of Europe amounted in round figures to £216,000,000. In 1912 they were £350,000,000. Here is the "annual cost" of diplomatic cowardice. Does it strike you as excusable, or even sane? Do not be bamboozled by arguments that "economically" war cannot be abolished. It is the most pernicious untruth and bankrupt drivel. I have worked out the estimates for 1912, and find that the British nation could give thirty shillings per week to every single man in her navies, her armies, and one-quarter of a million displaced workers, and still SAVE in that one year £22,999,400! That need not "interfere with the wages market"!

If every nation of the world (including Chinese,

Balkan, Turkish, and all such) gave £1 per week to every man in all their navies, all their armies, and three-quarters of a million displaced workers,¹ the world would have SAVED in 1912 alone £116,357,006!²

Were all these men paid these pensions and not allowed to come on the labour market at all, the surplus saving would pay for all the social improvements, educational schemes, and every development which could make man's life healthier, happier, and more worthy of that supreme gift of "Reason."

The future motto for each nation should be "Government of the people, by the people, for the people." And the one supreme motto for all nations of the earth: "Government of the peoples, by the peoples, for the peoples." No nobler work is possible than for each one of us to strive for this.

¹ An impossibly lavish estimate, taken purposely to forestall militarists.

² For fuller treatment see author's pamphlet, *War, Conscription, Armaments, and Sanity*.

XIII.

"WAR" AND "HUMAN NATURE."

I AM constantly told that "war" is one of the inevitable necessities of "human nature." Such a statement is, in my opinion, a good illustration of the almost universal and deplorable prevalence of what I can only describe as "sloppy thinking." Did we all use our true reasoning and thinking powers, honestly and conscientiously, most of the present social ills would not now exist, and the so-called progress of the human race, entitled "civilization," would not be such a mosaic of valuable fragments and poisonous rubbish.

The statement I am considering is really meaningless, as it deals with two absolutely indefinite quantities. What is "war"? What is "human nature"? The first savage who banged his opponent with a club exemplified "war," and the present disastrous struggle between genius and wealth, cultivated to their utmost for the destruction of life, is also "war." Even to-day, and in the same race, "war" varies from the gentlemanly conduct and tempered violence of Captain von Müller, of the "Emden," to the bestial atrocity of the greatest blackguard at Louvain. Which period or grade of these extended gradations does the upholder of the statement mean? Again, "human nature" is not a fixed quantity. It varies from the primitive man, whose "reason" entitled him to a definite claim to the term "human," up to the highest development of the physical and emotional qualities, as exemplified in Florence Nightingale, or the imaginative as Shakespeare, or the scientific and contemplative as Mill, Huxley, or Kelvin.

The only true meaning of the argument is that, in the case of each individual who makes the statement, "war," as it is visualized in his mind, is a necessary attribute of "human nature," as this is represented in his own personality. The hopelessness of any benefit from arguments and the impossibility of any real advancement are recognized when we realize that we can attach any meaning at all to the statement only by guessing what actual point upon the inclined plain, from primitive man to our highest conception of "rational humanity," this one man occupies, and then by further guessing whether, considering our speculation, we may expect him to carry out cannibalism, scalping, the immoral hooliganism of Louvain, or the restrained activities of the commander of the "Emden."

Considering the lamentable neglect of "true thinking" as to what is really "human nature," results in disasters in all directions of civilization, it is worth while trying to arrive at a better conception of what should be the attributes of "human nature." There is no necessity to insist that "man" is essentially an "animal." He is the "highest animal." But I think that this popular conception needs some qualifications, because in physical or "truly animal" qualities "man" is hopelessly out-classed by various "lower animals." His sight would be comparative blindness to an eagle; his hearing fatally obtuse to a deer and many others; his sense of smell a travesty to the hound; his touch and responsiveness to environment ludicrous in comparison with the lowest animals, and even plants; his strength but feebleness compared to the elephant; his agility contemptible when contrasted with the flea; his locomotion merely stagnation to a bird; and his industry simply idleness to an ant or bee.

Nor is there any need to raise the interesting question

as to how far we ought to credit any animal with the attributes of "thought" and "intelligence." The one unique faculty upon which "man" founds his entire claim for "humanity" is "reason." By "reason" I mean that power—possessed by no other animal—of correlating causes and effects, and either combining or eliminating forces and phenomena so as to produce further "causes and effects," extending either his power or his knowledge. By the operation of this one super-attribute, man has invented the telescope, which renders his aided sight as superior to that of the eagle as it was previously inferior. By the telephone he has extended his hearing beyond comparison with the most acute animal endowment. Chemical analysis has made him capable of detecting traces even smaller than those left by the contact of his feet and recognized by the hound. And although primitive forms of life detect and respond to such inconceivable differences as the presence or absence of a few "ions" of some elements in sea-water, this priceless gift has enabled man to go still further, and he has even weighed and calculated the velocity of, and measured the electrical charges upon, these same "ions." His production of the locomotive has given him command of strength impossible to even regiments of elephants; while steam and electricity endow him with wider transport than any bird, and more productiveness and utility than the ant or bee.

This "reason" is at once the most delicate, the most incisive, and the most powerful means for good or evil which it is possible for the mind of man to conceive. To it alone are due all the glory and all the advancement of the human race up through the long ages, ever extending man's domain over nature, ever increasing his distance from his animal ancestors, ever reacting upon itself and sharpening its own keen edge as man acquires more and

more expertness in the management of its marvellous possibilities. But, like every other instrument, the more it is improved and rendered keener or more powerful, the greater is the danger when it is used without ever-increasing knowledge and anxious calculation. With every step in its advance towards usefulness there is the equal step in its power for disaster. This is why we see to-day that the utmost benefit man has gained from this incomparable gift of "reason" is counterbalanced by the equal magnification of every horror and atrocity resulting from the activities of the products of his "reason" towards destruction, either due to carelessness or depravity.

This deplorable development is not in any way a "law of nature" or a "necessity." It is due entirely to the lingering domination in man of passions and lusts inherited from his animal ancestors. The increase of man's reason is in the nature of "compound interest." The amount gained one year is added to the capital, and so the yearly "interest" always increases, and progress is at an ever-accelerating speed. Man has applied his reasoning faculty to all processes of thought and social and industrial development, with one exception, and that one neglected direction is unfortunately the most important and essential. Man has never yet honestly applied his "reason" to the criticism of the motive with which, and the manner in which, he himself makes use of his "reason."

Surely this one hope, this single power for the advancement and ennoblement of the human race, should impress irresistibly upon its possessors that its every use should be criticized beforehand; that no anxiety is too great as to whether its keenness may possibly cause wounding and damage through neglect of honest and deliberate calculation as to whether—when the irretrievable cut

has been made—things will be changed entirely for the better, and that not even a scratch has resulted which might have been obviated by better consideration of methods or superior skill in execution. Every reproach to “civilization” is due to man’s failure in his stewardship of this one priceless extra talent. Genius and wealth combine for greater gains from nature. They neglect to calculate whether the more complicated machinery and the greater output will sacrifice workers. Yet equal honest thought would have evolved counter-vailing safeguards. So, while man has striven arduously to improve the conditions of life, he has striven with equal ardour to render misery and destruction more wholesale and horrible. And this irrational jumble of morality and immorality is what we call “human nature”! It results, as I have already stated, from the total neglect of the use of “reason” itself to control the operations and ambitions of this same “reason” in the development of the human race. It certainly proves the argument that “war” (as idealized by each separate individual) is according to “human nature” AS IT IS TO-DAY. But this statement is not an “excuse”; it is an “accusation.” “Human nature” is a progressive thing. It is not the same to-day as yesterday. For its progress and improvement each one of us is responsible, with a responsibility we can in no way shirk, and for the abuse of which no excuse is possible.

If “human nature” is such to-day that abuses exist, it is the highest duty of each one of us to “push human nature along to-day,” and to keep on pushing, so that the “abuse” of to-day shall become the “impossibility” of to-morrow. There are multitudes of abuses and denials of reason in national and international relationships. Nobody outside a lunatic asylum can maintain that the essence of war is any moral or rational glory of

the human race, in spite of the imbecile suggestions of "development of character," etc. Many lusts of power or greed, as exemplified in the Prussian military caste, are trying to drag human nature back to the animal, and to dethrone human "reason," lest it lift man above their own sordid schemes. The future lies with those of us who will subdue animal passions and self-interest, and with honest endeavour strive to establish "the supreme law of reason's powers and reason's direction of those powers."

XIV.

THE FUTURE "WELTPOLITIK."

So far as the future progress and happiness of the human race are concerned, the world has already obtained the victory in the present war. As in the French Revolution, the only part of the victory which really matters is the new territory of freedom of thought and opinion, the broader outlook, and the destruction of some of those relics of oppression and ignorance which smothered reason and bound thought with the antique fetters of selfish class domination and feudal sovereignty. It is a sad reflection upon "man as a reasoning animal" that all great revolutions of thought have been opposed by physical violence, and won only through physical sacrifice and suffering. It is one of the, as yet, unrecognized features of evolution that the higher development of the mental and reasoning faculties is hindered and thwarted by the too strong "animal propensities." Does man's better nature recognize that his highest work is for the common good? His animal passion or lust weights him down, so that he must perform this task under a penalizing handicap. Does he succeed in so helping others that he is elevated to some position of distinction? Too often the relief of the tension hitherto maintained over his lower nature gives his animal passions their opportunity, and he is carried away, a shattered idol, in a mad rush for wealth or dictatorship. So, the priceless victories for justice and reason won in the French Revolution were purchased through degrading human passions and

sufferings. In like manner, the present war is a "world-revolution." It is not a war of Germany against France or Russia. It is not a war of England against Germany. It is a world-revolution against oppression of freedom and higher development of the human mind and race. It is an extension of the democratic demand for further territories of human thought and sympathy. No longer are the democracies satisfied with the horizon of the parish pump. The interests and happiness of all their fellow countrymen have gripped their imaginations for years past, ever since the democracy of France led the way in the emancipation of the "people" from a state of "existence on sufferance" under an aristocracy, and established their right to share in the regulation of their own destinies.

This longing of the democracies to sympathetically work out the good of the "peoples" is all that now remains of nobility in the word "patriotism." This emotion is thus far clean and commendable; but in daily use now it means, in ninety-nine per cent. of cases, some despicable principle of grabbing trade, territory, or prestige from any other nation—always presuming that the user of the word imagines that he thereby sees his way to personal acquisition or aggrandizement.

The French Revolution did much to break down the ignorant barriers between classes; "ignorant" because only false ideas could have erected them, and also because only the dejection of defrauded humanity in the "people" would have endured them.

The present war has won a victory far more pregnant with blessings to the human race than even the French Revolution. It has burst the wider—but still "ignorant"—barriers of thought which acted like barbed-wire entanglements between international sympathies, and in this greater triumph has extended and consolidated the

earlier victory by demonstrating that one great national peril proves the community of interests, and sweeps away in a flood of reason and unselfishness the remaining rotten fences of "class prejudice."

When physical hostilities had really commenced; when the allied nations had bound themselves in a community of interests, perhaps varied in passions and lower ambitions, but at any rate absolutely coinciding in the higher plane of thought and reason which demands the annihilation of every despotic control over every democracy, and also of every attempt to limit their freedom of thought and sympathy; when the colonies of the British Empire spontaneously rushed to its aid, offering far more of their manhood, their wealth, and their love freely, from their own desires for freedom and destruction of the chains of oppression—far more sacrifice in the cause of right than we could have extorted by compulsion had they not been self-governing; when the neutral nations, from the smallest up to that confederation of the west, the United States of America, recognized that the future progress of mankind demanded the destruction of this last atrocious attempt for animal passions and domination to subjugate and confine onward-marching thought—THEN was the true "victory" already won. The present carnage was unnecessary. It is only payment of tribute to man's lowest nature. In truth it is worse than this, for it is the vilest of animal passions, multiplied, intensified, and cultivated by the prostitution of that one supreme talent of "reason" which was given to him especially to lift him above his animal inheritance. "Justice," as the result of a war between any two nations, is identical with that "justice" which gives the carcase to the stronger of the two hyenas who have fought for it. The winner has no higher claim nor the loser any less merit in a war than the respective hyenas. War is

as ruinous and revolting upon the physical side as it is lamentable and disgraceful to every particle of mental or spiritual superiority which man enjoys over these hyenas.

Whether a nation of A's gets this earth-surface, or whether any nation down to the Z's loses some corner plot, matters nothing to the destiny of man. The only question is: How much freedom of thought, how much honest exercise of "reason"?

Many of us have recognized that any future extension of justice and happiness does not in any way depend upon physical struggles. We know that the popular belief in the bloated physical development of any individual nation and its expenditure of genius and wealth in the "science of war," is nothing but a stumbling-block to the true race-development, and is as idiotic as it would be to suppose that the hypertrophied muscles and the brutal instincts of a prizefighter contribute in any possible way to the true happiness and intellectual development of his family.

There is a lamentable bankruptcy of truth and reason in the curious argument that physical violence and murder between man and man, or the cunning training of Fagin or the garroter, are all horrible and deserve the cat-o'-nine-tails or the noose, but that multiply the "man" into a thousand or a million, call this collection an "army" and the intended victims an "unfriendly nation," and by so doing you make the calling "noble" and the violence "the means of developing the very best in human nature."

The truest patriotism demands that we should not wait for the futile animal contests to cease before we fully recognize that, no matter what shuffling of material prizes or losses may occur, the real victory is already won. Thought and sympathy have surged over all

barriers of distance or nationality. They can never again be driven into cramped "national pens." The "politik" of each member of each democracy cannot again be restricted to his own locality, his own nation. His mind has been enlarged, his outlook broadened, and in the future he will ask not only "how does this development affect me and my family," or even "how does it affect my class or my country," but he will in his reasoning follow its ramifications into the distant influences upon the members of those races who fought with him in the present "world revolution."

Victories in the higher plane are true advances in the evolution of the human race. They are permanent in value. Any subsequent advance is not a mere reshuffling of property, like the silly and shifting "frontiers" artificially drawn to separate mankind into opposing cliques, and which, be they never so hateful or strict, can affect only his "physical" side, but are of no effect to restrain his thought or his sympathy. Any victory upon this higher plane of "thought evolution" is universal and permanent. It raises the human race higher, and, no matter what the religion of any nation, such elevation of humanity must coincide with its highest developments.

Throughout all the present lamentable waste of life and wealth we are sustained by the hope that the victory now won in man's highest plane must ensure that this is the last time that any nation's reason can be so degraded or debauched as to imagine that any true interest can be advanced by denying all man's superiority to the lowest animals, dethroning his reason, and settling his disputes with his fangs and his mad passions.

So far as it is possible to state any position fairly within the limits of a sentence, the "victory" which is now accomplished is the recognition by practically the whole human race that "thought and sympathy" shall

be free, and that no "despot," either of class, aristocracy, or nation, shall for the future chain these human attributes by any class prejudice or selfish lust of wealth or power. The appalling sacrifices of life now necessary to convince the attempted bigot of this new truth shall consecrate the coming brotherhood of reason and world-wide justice.

The conviction that "war" is futile, that it accomplishes nothing of true benefit to the human race, and that every step of progress can be taken only as a result of the education and evolution of the mental and moral faculties of mankind, does not in the slightest degree detract from the merits or glories of the brave men who are sacrificing all that makes life worth living, if not life itself, in the terrible struggles on the battlefields. They are fulfilling the noblest heroism according to the present standards. Their sincerity and devotion command our highest respect. Our sharpest pain is the knowledge that this "standard" is mistaken; that the sacrifices are in truth "unnecessary," as the real "victory" is already accomplished; and that the horrible struggles and sufferings now fulfil nothing but an outgrown barbaric custom.

Physical destruction of the bodies of enemies—be it never so wholesale or revolting—not only is absolutely futile for the accomplishment of true progress, but actually obstructs with passion and pain the very progress it is supposed to perform; just as religion was not in any way assisted, but brought into disrepute, through "religious" wars and oppressions.

We look forward to this appalling calamity banishing this false and atrocious standard of morality, and trust that never again will such sacrifice be either permitted or condoned. It will be regarded with the same pathetic regrets as the equally sincere and the equally noble

(according to their still more antiquated standard) self-sacrifice of the Indian widow who gladly meets death upon her husband's funeral-pyre. It may be "heroic," it is "noble," judged by our present civilization, but it is far from "rational"; and this "rational" plane is the only one upon which we, as human beings, can claim any superiority over the rest of the animal creation. Now is the time to demonstrate the birth of a higher standard. Now, while the sufferings entailed by the worship of a false deity are acute. Now, when even the great unthinking mass of humanity is startled out of its lethargy, and is horrified by the callous brutality of this odious object of man's barbaric devotion. Can the most hide-bound militarist point to one single true benefit, one advance in thought or happiness, one blessing to mankind, which may occur after the War, and which could not have been secured by honest good feeling and the guidance of pure "reason"?

It may be asked: "If it is true that no step in progress is taken through physical struggles, but that the improvement and elevation of the human race are entirely bound up with, and depend upon, the advances of opinions and the breaking away from those passions and prejudices based upon animal impulses, but rejected by true 'reason,' how can such a disaster as 'war' still be possible?"

The answer is that this hopeless "contradiction in terms" is due to moral invalidism, or perhaps a better phrase would be "moral Rickett's disease." The faculty of "rational judgment" is stunted, flabby, anæmic, and decidedly groggy at the joints. This is shown in one direction by its cowardice in defending many absolutely silly courses of action by holding up the white-flag of "custom."

The silliest things imaginable and the most disastrous things possible are due to this blighting fetish of "custom,"

which thwarts the advance of reformed thought and reason at every step. What is a "custom"? It is a rule of conduct established by usage. To be a "custom" it must have existed for a length of time—years or centuries. Therefore it must have been initiated when knowledge was more primitive. If we do not know better now than did our ancestors when they started the custom, we ought to be ashamed of ourselves. I do not deny the possibility of an ancient custom being correct, as I do not deny the possibility of a man making a "bull's-eye" in the dark; but until I have turned up the light and seen that it is truly a "bull's-eye," I am not going to believe the score, and even then I shall certainly not believe that marksmanship is really better aided by being carried on in the dark than in the best possible light. The only safe rule is: "If it is a 'custom,' suspect it; at any rate, any man who uses an instrument fashioned years or centuries ago, without honestly testing it with to-day's knowledge, is irrational and unreliable."

What has "custom" to do with "war"? It has everything to do with it. It is the antithesis of "rationalism." The progress of mankind on its highest plane of a "rational being" is daily impeded by these "rocks of custom," which two—and only "two"—enemies of progress throw into the path. These "two enemies" are "ignorance" and "cowardice." The former we can in some measure excuse, although we must accept blame for the persistence of ignorance itself, as it could have been diminished by better and more honest efforts for education. But there are multitudes of people who "know" that a "custom" is against true reason, yet they obey it, and enforce it. They have no excuse; only the disgrace of cowards.

"Custom" vitiates every department of life. One

simple example is the custom which obliges elderly men, even in the worst of weather, to keep their hats off during a funeral. This results in constant illnesses and deaths which are no tributes of honour to a departed friend, but merely tributes of cowardice to an irrational custom. And we can trace the baneful influence up through all activities and ages until we arrive at that supreme pinnacle of aborted sanity where "custom" no longer maintains that one single death can atone for one personal insult or dishonour, but that, should there be merely a suspicion of a "slight" to a community of aggregated single individuals, only cowardice would permit these men to inquire whether there was any true damage to either principle or prosperity. The only so-called "honourable" course is to descend to the moral level discarded for the duel, and shame the most savage beasts of prey by using man's highest gifts so that millions of men should mutually slaughter one another, their sole impulse being an indefinable sensation of "duty-hate." That no one special man has any real grounds for even anger with any other single man opposing him is proved by the paradox of soldiers of the two enemies fraternizing together, until suddenly what can only be termed a "blasphemous" order due to military "custom" makes them substitute the rifle-bullet for the hand-shake, and the infernal shell for the friendly cigarette. Add to these millions of deaths of the picked manhood of the nations (not a single one of which has in any manner truly accomplished any more for the real ennoblement or happiness of the human race than the knocking over of a ninepin) the millions of widows, more millions of fatherless or orphans, and we have a tabulated statement—only so far as it concerns human life and not inanimate nature—of the debt we owe to the cowardice which prevents the individuals of a nation from extending to

the consideration of wholesale murder the belated restraints and morality which have been imposed upon the comparatively retail and harmless duel. Fortunately, "thought" is in advance of "courage"; but what a disgrace to man's supreme gift of "reason" that, although present-day thought is horrified at the cruelties of war, the masses have been too cowardly to speak out and forbid relapses into barbarism!

A human holocaust has resulted from this cowardice, and I do not envy any individual who can utter one single word in defence of war after this appalling disaster. His own reasoning and moral outlook must be indeed cramped if he continues of the opinion that a combined "national conscience" composed of so many millions of such "individual consciences" is not of sufficient strength to rule men's conduct when not warped by paralyzing traditions.

Again, there is nothing but unreasoning custom to excuse the persistence of the political arrangement by which the entire "foreign policy" of any nation is a private subterranean preserve of one or two ministers. In former times, when relations were primitive and points of contact and friction rare, such an arrangement was adequate, if not reasonable. But to-day, when it is impossible to mention one single national activity which is not also "international" in its effects and relations, this thrusting of overwhelming responsibility upon the same few subterranean workers in the old-time excavated warrens is nothing less than lunacy. A child could control the ancient spinning-wheel, but who is mad enough to load this child with the management of a modern Lancashire mill?

One or two men could efficiently manage the old-time ferry-boat, but only in the most hopeless wards of a mad-house could it be argued that therefore the same crew

and the same methods were all that were necessary to run to-day's Atlantic liner. It is the opaque glass of "custom" which has prevented the peoples from seeing that when regarded by reason, freed from the shackles of ignorance and cowardice, our antiquated "foreign policy" methods are no less insane than it would be to work any other intensely complicated industry through the staffs and rules which obtained in primitive simplicity.

This irrational custom of manning the modern complicated national machine by the limited crew, who work in secret, apart from the bracing atmosphere of criticism, and with outlook narrowed through eternal focussing within "diplomatic" limits, has resulted in the respective "foreign-office crews" entirely losing control of their respective huge vessels. There is thus precipitated the most terrifying collision in human history, and millions of human lives and cargoes of human happiness are sunk in an abyss of barbarism and incompetence; a disaster not in any way reflecting upon the principles of these crews, who have done their best, but due entirely and directly to absolute incompetence in the management of each firm who continued to send out such limited crews in charge of ever-increasing complexity and weight of the transports they were expected to control. THIS is one—if not the first—alteration to be made in the future Weltpolitik. The relationships of nations are at least as important as the relationships of individual classes within each nation. Yet the interests and questions affecting the smaller groups within a nation, where only progress is at stake, receive the combined wisdom of the nation for their consideration; whereas the all-enclosing questions affecting all nationalities, and therefore necessarily all these classes multiplied indefinitely, are withdrawn from any control but that of the old boat's crew who pottered along

when there was nothing more disastrous than a rowing-boat!

If this War has proved anything, it is that what is the business of one nation is also the business of all other nations in these days of inter-communications. No Emperor may now stop a water-way or a railroad even upon his own domain, and deny that it is anybody's right to protest. The blocking of a foot-path by a squire may give just cause of complaint to the inhabitants of a distant parish. The fact that the squire has encouraged me to use this thoroughfare when I traded for his benefit stops him from denying it to me merely as a personal whim or the whim of a few officials.

Incontrovertible proof of the disastrous effects of custom are found in the repeated instances where growing reason has attempted to introduce sense into foreign policy, but where every single attempt has been blighted at a breath in the phrase: "These matters are of so delicate a nature that it is essential that they be conducted in privacy!"

Yet this statement is not only bunkum of the grossest variety, but it is the absolute opposite of the truth. In what does this "extraordinary delicacy" consist? Certainly, no question of "fact" fears sunlight. The only "delicacy" consists entirely in the petulance, temper, moral obliquity, or feeble-mindedness of one or more men, in one or more of these private groups of these very private negotiators. "A" is so cranky that he keeps all the other letters of the alphabet dithering; while "B's" temper requires constant soothing by the combined efforts of "C" to "Z"! Then "X" is notoriously of a gambling tendency, and it is unending worry to hedge him off from staking a nation's existence on some atrocious "bluff." And, finally, "Z" himself

ought really to be in a lunatic asylum, and keeps insisting that you can make progress run backwards to the regretted "feudal privileges," as easily as he maintains that you can make water run up-hill! There you have the only possible "extraordinary delicacies" of "international negotiations," stated according to "human reason" in defiance of "proprieties" or "custom."

They form a rotten excuse for the present war. Why, the only possible cure is the publicity advocated by all rational thinkers. All these "difficult" cranks, these blusterers, and these gamblers in secrecy of custom, trade entirely upon this very "secrecy." The greatest moral bully is the greatest moral coward; and whereas the present "diplomatic nonsense" pays him deference and invites his further aggressions or lunacies, publicity given to his utterances would curl him up to the accompaniment of one universal shout of derisive laughter. It is well recognized that the present war is due to a "failure of negotiations"; and a "failure" due largely to a merely natural disposition of one single man. That such calamities should hang upon the whims or conduct of any one brain is a disgrace to the sanity of all the other brains condemned to reap the miseries of his aberrations. It cannot be questioned that the universal revulsion of feeling caused by the magnitude, the haunting horror, and the world-wide devastation of the present war has caused a revolution, if not a "somersault," in the political consciences of the democracies, and even in the aristocracies, of the world. The magnitude of the threat, the terror of the ruin, flowed over and destroyed many old "class barriers," and proved not only the possibility, but the inherent necessity, of developments for the common good hitherto known as "Socialism." I am not in the least afraid of the title of "Socialist." It is such a wide term that it includes the highest

morality—*i.e.*, “the greatest good of the greatest number,” and down to the unbalanced schemes of the street-corner agitator. But I have yet to find within its widest extensions an emotion as mean, a morality as contemptible, as is unctuously covered, and too often honoured, when it labels itself as “patriotism.”

The “Future Weltpolitik” will, therefore, be free from many of the shackles of prejudice, class hatred, and selfishness which existed previously. When one democracy has spontaneously given of its blood and treasure in common fight against despotism, never again will it be possible to foment suspicions in secret “diplomatic” caves. When aristocrat, middle-class, and artizan have stood shoulder to shoulder upon the battlefield, and worked together as they have never done in any previous war, although each may return to his station, he will in future better understand the characters, the hopes, and the similar sterling manhood which exists both beneath the veneer and the fustian. It will be with a totally modified outlook and a smoother tone that the various political questions will be considered, and men will be more ready to recognize that each member of another class is essentially of the same sterling worth as himself, and that it is only moral weakness which permits either the aloofness of the aristocrat or the resentment of the worker. With honesty and rationalism the magnitude of this calamity, the like of which the world has never previously endured, may be exceeded by the abundance of the blessings gathered from the ruination of the prison and the bursting of the chains which bound “reason” as the prisoner of “prejudice.”

With courageous reason, so-called “impossibilities” are performed with facility. Control of the railways, finance, food prices, commercial exchanges, destitution—all and each, formerly declared by prejudice-bound opinion

to be "impossible," have been proved to be capable of accomplishment by one decision under a necessity which scoffs at "prejudices." Is it possible that whatever of good is found in such measures should be surrendered and again buttressed by the old selfish prejudices?

No! The "Future Weltpolitik" will be saner than any previous method. It will recognize that as each nation is a mass of intertwining interests, so the commonwealth of the human race is only a larger group of similar intertwining purposes and necessities. It will introduce an atmosphere of reason and honesty into all human relationships, of such improved purity that those organisms which depend upon foul or impure sustenance will be smothered and perish in the cleanliness of their environment.

There is one threatening danger, and I would insist with all my powers upon its immediate recognition and resolute destruction. Let the democracies beware at the commencement of the new era of the malignity of "vested interests." These are the foul germs which must perish for want of the slime of corruption in the new stream of rational politics. They will attempt to prove the absurdity of attaining by simple honesty the peace and progress which has not been secured "even with the greatest foresight and most conscientious preparations"! Such counsellors must be kicked out with the "most conscientious vigour."

Also let me forestall the most dangerous of all—*i.e.*, the "false friend." Every station of life—but particularly the so-called "leaders of public opinion"—will acknowledge that "nobody can possibly defend war; in fact, it is in essence lunacy. But so long as it is the method of settling quarrels we are helpless"! This is knowledge combined with moral cowardice. "War is lunacy; therefore the only suggestion we can make has

nothing whatever to do with any attempt to cure the disease, but establishes the 'necessity' for us to be a lunatic of a two- or a three-power standard!"

It is not only moral cowardice, but also irrational twaddle. Any critic may keep his very cheap sneer embodying the stock phrase, "Where would we have been now except for," etc? Neither I nor any other pleader for a morality above the animal is so weak-minded as to go about among footpads without adequate weapons of defence. But where our judgment differs from our critics is that we do not consider the division of mankind into footpads and victims as the ideal one. We are not content to strenuously devote our efforts to multiplying the footpads at enormous expense, and then bankrupting the victims with the necessity of ever-progressive devilish weapons for protection. There are even now many men who, with inflated chests, blatantly claim that "THEY knew all about it"! "Had the nation only attended to them, we should have been twice as near to bankruptcy and able to slay twice as many foreigners!" I do not envy their notoriety or their standards. It is lamentable that international morality still necessitates the antics of savage beasts in disputing with any man who happens to belong to a nation across some imaginary and easily removable line called a frontier; but is it necessary that it should always remain so?

These so-called "prophets" and self-dubbed "saviours of their country" may have some credit for uttering the warning that these animal passions were disgracefully working up again. But what little grain was their own personal contribution to the curing of the insanity or the assuaging of anger? Have they personally lifted one finger to help either reason or justice to gain a footing? True, they will work in the limelight, and shout that "the day of wrath is at hand"; but, after

all, that is not the noblest work they might perform. Had they kept some of their breath and a little of their energy for some small contribution to the moral development of opinion and education in their own circle, their own nation; had they guarded their tongues so as to speak fairly and not provocatively of their bogeys of anything but disaster to any other nation—they would have a better claim upon the gratitude of mankind, in so far that they had at any rate not obstructed its slow and toilsome climb up from lower to higher ideals and accomplishments. Let us all watch these counsellors, whether in the press or political world. We can agree with them that there can be no pandering to remaining insanity in any one or more directions. But if we find any man, whether leader or member of the rank and file, who devotes his entire energies to preparing for future outbreaks of similar lunacy, and contents himself with inane platitudes about war being “necessary in the present state of morality,” while not honestly performing his share of the work necessary to lift “morality” from such a degraded station where such necessity persists—publicly mark that man as a traitor to the truest interests of the race. Dethrone him from any pedestal of popular eminence, and make room for some man who can see and appreciate BOTH sides of the question, and who will put the better part of his endeavours into that part of the work which elevates mankind ABOVE war, and NOT into that pandering to the lunacy by multiplying the occasions for and the embodiments of the hateful delusions.

Each single step that ever has been made, or ever can be made, in the true progress of the human race has been only the manifestation of some further “evolution upon the mental plane.” The development of opinion, the increase of education, the growth of the desire for freedom

and a fuller, more intelligent, more hopeful life, where thought, sympathy, and ambition course more rapidly through the brain; the longing to burst the fetters which bind man's mind within the narrow circle of his daily task; the inherent urging to endow his mind with freedom, so that it may soar to heights where, in thought and knowledge at least, it can "grasp creation with a span":—these aspirations alone have propelled the race ever upward. Every war has been either the mad attempt of some despot or vested interest to crush these ambitions, or the irresistible explosion of the same pent-up forces to rend the chains of oppression and custom.

The ultimate victory is assured. It is an immutable law of evolution. Man **MUST** tread the path of progressive development. Every attempt to thwart this progress is like trying to invent an obstacle which shall defeat an irresistible force. Let us at once recognize the glorious future which is inevitable, and help all mankind to hasten its realization. Let us acknowledge the futility of attempting, by paroxysms of hopeless degradation and the crime of physical slaughter, to stem the rising tide of mental evolution of the race, which cannot be slaughtered by the most devilish guns.

When the human race was a child, it did as a child; but now that it has become a man, let it "put away childish things." Only then, when strife and hatred have been cast aside as unworthy, shall man attain his true and noble stature, and "all things shall work together for good."

6-26-11

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY

Los Angeles

This book is DUE on the last date stamped below.

REC'D LD-URL

QL APR 15 1991

JUN 3 0 1991



